

# JOURNAL

## OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS

NABI

VOLUME II

1934

PART II

### \*RE-THINKING OUR AIMS AS BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS

PROFESSOR CLARA WILLOUGHBY DAVIDSON, *Randolph-Macon Woman's College*

TO offer such a group as this suggestions on "Re-thinking our Aims as Biblical Instructors" would seem to be a clear case of carrying owls to Athens. My own conception of my function, this evening, accords rather with the conception of the prophet's function expressed by one of our sophomores on a recent examination paper. "The prophet," she wrote, "was the mouth-organ of Jehovah." Perhaps, then, a personal statement will express the group mind on certain questions. Failing that, it may serve, with equal profit, to focalize our thinking for the moment at points not only of agreement but of difference.

Recent contributions to the publications of this society apparently indicate that many of us in different parts of the country, facing different specific problems in our work with student groups, have moved on from positions commonly held, or which we ourselves held, twenty years ago, to new aims or at least to new emphases. If we have done neither, there are indications that something in the present state of affairs, general or academic, has induced in us a sense of obligation to defend positions which we did not question before the World War. For that, that major catastrophe in civilization, with its perceptible results, has faced us in our special capacity with inescap-

able and searching questions seems to me indubitable.

What I understand to be for many a change in point of view, or a shift in emphasis, is accentuated for me by the fact that my own teaching experience has been split into two parts by a period of non-academic life, spent very largely with mature persons, among whom the younger generation assumed only the type of importance which is theirs in general society. The interval has resulted for me in a more realistic view of the modern scene, a deeper perception of the primary needs of human beings as such, and a fresh sense of the responsibility of professional educators for fitting the oncoming generations to participate creatively in the social life of their own day and so to serve as vital factors in the day that is ever dawning.

The curiosity of a student, last spring, by forcing me to commit myself suddenly, made me realize more keenly the way that I had come in the past few years. As we were driving back to the college from a camp-fire supper in the woods, one member of the party turned on me with an explosive question, "Why are you teaching the Bible?" It was the work of but a moment to discover that her interest was not biographical, and I had no time to frame a proper answer. But I found one ready-made on my tongue. "Be-

\*Read at the Annual Meeting.

cause," I heard myself say, "I want you to have all there is of life, in this or any other world." Later, a colleague to whom I reported the incident commented, "But that is true of most of us who are teaching. It is not a point of view peculiar to your subject." I was glad enough to agree with her. From the possibility of that agreement arises the first proposition that I would submit to you, namely that

1. The aim of college biblical instruction is at one with that of education in general, the freeing of the individual for creative social living in his own day, motivated by the highest purposes that he is capable of forming in view of the best that has been thought and achieved in the past.

A second proposition which, to my mind, flows inevitably from the first is this, that

2. The educational process at its best is a religious process. That is to say, all true education is religious education. It is the part of the biblical instructor to attempt to secure recognition of this principle.

As definitions of religion indicative of the point of view here represented, I quote two, which seem to me unusually suggestive. The first was given by Dr. Eugene W. Lyman in a study of the Philosophy of Religion, a number of years ago, "Religion is a conscious co-working with an Unseen Power for the conserving, organizing, and creating of Personal and Social values."\* Although it spoils the balance of the sentence, I should like to insert another idea in the series, namely, discovery, to read, "for the discovering, conserving, organizing, and creating of personal and social values." The second is a description found in a treatment of The Philosophy of Religion by the Welsh professor, D. Miall Edwards. Religion "is loyalty of heart, will, and thought to that ultimate goodness which is ultimate reality; it is allegiance to the cosmos in its deepest meaning."† Without attempting to

enter the lists with yet another definition, I may perhaps safely assume that, as religious persons, we who are here gathered recognize religion as conscious adjustment to Reality for the achievement of the highest individual and social ends. As representatives of the Jewish-Christian tradition, whether or not we consider ourselves monists in philosophy, we probably go further, to the point of recognizing that Reality to which adjustment must be made in order to achieve individual and social creativity as personal in character—perhaps I should say as "at least personal," in order to allow for that Plus which it may be the part of humility to add to any human symbol for the Unknown Real.

In representing education at its best as a religious process, I am taking for granted two positions with reference to the nature of education. The first is that education is not merely a process of acquiring knowledge, but that it is a process of personal and social adjustment to Reality, under whatever guise Reality be conceived, involving a critical choice of ends, both individual and social, and self-directed effort, creative in nature, toward the attainment of these ends. In such a view the education of any individual involves his release from fears, inhibitions, ignorances, inabilities, all sorts of limitations upon his life as a self-directed human being, functioning creatively in a social environment. Whatever knowledge he obtains is "not purchased by the loss of power," but is contributive to his power.

In the second place, I assume that education conceived as an active process is not therefore to be confused with training. Education conceived as training cannot possibly be regarded as a religious process. For training, whether in school or out, presupposes an end uncritically accepted, for the attainment of which a certain technique is prescribed. That such training, no matter how important the end toward which it is directed, or how effective the technique acquired, is not educa-

\*Lecture Notes, Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1921-2.  
†The Philosophy of Religion, page 156.

tion, the colleges of Liberal Arts have long recognized. Only as the student is freed to make his own adjustments to Reality, to choose by the use of his powers of criticism and analysis ends which he finds desirable and to direct his own activity in creative endeavor toward the realization of those ends, can he be said to have experienced a process that is fully educational. Certain types of vocational training suggest themselves at once as failing on both counts to merit designation as educational processes. They have to do only with obtaining a body of knowledge and with acquiring certain skills. A certain type of biblical training by this definition falls outside the realm of education and cannot properly be called religious, however acceptably orthodox may be the result. But that technical training may find a place within a general scheme of education, properly so-called, the universities attest. Its inclusion is merited, however, only when it is subordinated to the purposes of general education and its relation to these purposes made evident. This is as true of technical training in biblical studies as in any other.

Now if the purpose of biblical instruction is at one with the purpose of general education, and if education, properly conceived, is religious, it behooves biblical instructors to assist in the recognition of the essentially religious character of the educational process not only on the part of their students but by educators generally.

I would suggest that certain crying evils in our educational system today might be eliminated if college administrators and faculties became conscious of it. Probably all of us are aware on the one hand of the water-tight compartments into which the minds of our students seem to be divided, so that the implications of one intellectual discipline for another are barely perceived, much less fully considered, and on the other, of the students' own demand for some teaching or method that will enable them to "see life" not only

"steadily" but "whole." It is toward the meeting of this demand and the overcoming of the purely agglutinative method of acquisition of knowledge, that modern so-called orientation courses have been directed. But these specific courses in orientation, while undoubtedly interesting and to some extent, probably, efficacious, have apparently unavoidable sources of failure inherent in their type. No matter how skillful the brief presentation of a wide field or the tracing of relationships among different intellectual disciplines, it is impossible to overcome the student's lack of background in knowledge and in that appreciation of the nature of a discipline which comes from actual exercise in its processes. Moreover, the education of any given student, in so far as the college is responsible for it, involves the total impact of the life of the college upon him and his total reaction to it. No course of study can orient him in a society, the various phases of which are conducted without reference to an inclusive aim or a common point of view. If one part of his life as an active participant in the college gives the lie to another, and if there is no unity in point of view or no common perception of the end of education, or of life itself, among the official teachers and administrators of the institution, so-called orientation courses can but fail to integrate him with his disintegrated environment.

If the faculty of an institution could come to see the essentially religious nature of the process in which they are engaged, specific courses of study would be presented in their fundamental unity as a result of the teachers' own perception of their inter-relationships and of methods consequently designed to secure the students' recognition of part to whole and of part to part. The charge, brought against orientation courses, of superficiality in the treatment of certain portions of a field due to lack of expert knowledge, or to lack of time, would be thrown out of court, as well as the charge that it is impossible for a

student to understand subjects in the methodology of which he has had no practice.

There would still be endless opportunity for study of the place of each discipline, in its various phases, in the total project of so adjusting the individual to Reality as to enable him to live creatively to the highest personal and social ends. Constant modification of theory and method would still follow upon discovery. Fresh analyses and syntheses would be perpetually demanded by the increase of knowledge. But a college faculty would move together toward the achievement of an inclusive purpose and each department, and each instructor, could therefore plan work intelligently with reference to that purpose. The students would, as a result, be spared a deal of waste effort and friction and unpurposive activity in their academic lives, not to mention chaotic and discouraged states of mind, and consequent unsocial, or meaningless, or anarchic behaviour in their relationships in general.

Present difficulties in the way of any such unifying of the system of education in our colleges as a result of a general recognition of the essentially religious character of the educational process are obvious. The chief difficulty lies in the fact that there is no dominant philosophy of life in our modern western world. We can at present have no such integrated system of education as could merit the title of religious education because every university and every college of any size represents in its ruling body not merely varying, but conflicting, points of view about the meaning and conduct of life.

Granted that biblical instructors have a peculiar duty and opportunity to further the recognition by administrators, faculties, and students of the essentially religious nature of the educational process, how can we function best in the present situation so inhospitable to such recognition? The answer in modern years has been to regard Religious Education as a separate discipline. Therefore, although religion is a term as wide as personal life in

its conscious relations with that which it conceives to be Real, and although education has as its goal the conscious adjustment of the individual to that envioning Reality for the achievement of the highest personal and social ends in accordance with the best thought and achievement of the race, the term Religious Education has come to be used for that part of the curriculum of a college which is in the hands of a special department. This department is variously called the Department of Religion, of Biblical History, of Biblical Literature, and History, and so on. The subjects included are, I take it, of less importance for an understanding of its function and opportunities than the fact that the religious education of students is so largely committed to its care.

In view of this widespread condition I would offer for your consideration a third proposition, namely that

3. Religious Education, as a special discipline, has as its aim the conscious adjustment of the individual to Reality under the aspect of personal and moral life for the realization of those individual and social ends which are in accord with the Jewish-Christian tradition and especially with the attitudes and teachings of Jesus.

In the present situation, we who represent the Jewish-Christian tradition have a certain advantage over some of our colleagues in other fields. In the first place, we possess a philosophy of life. This philosophy is by all but one of the nations of the West nominally accepted as dominant, and is in some of its phases embodied in certain of their institutions. Moreover, it has received classic expression in an immortal literature, and it is that literature which we are set to teach.

Certain difficulties, however, confront us at the outset of any attempt to view our situation realistically. The very fact that the peoples of the West call themselves Christian increases the difficulty of making clear the implications of the Jewish-Christian ethic for



individuals and for society, and of the religion of the prophets and of Jesus for the modern man. And that Jewish-Christian philosophy of life which recommends itself so highly to us is violently or passively rejected by many of our colleagues. Again, however strongly we may be convinced that this philosophy is fundamentally sound, the enormous recent increase of knowledge of the physical universe, and of its modes of behaviour, and of man and his mind and the causes of his behaviour, and the unprecedented complexity of society, make necessary constant re-interpretation of the meaning of the philosophy in and for our modern world.

Neither have we recourse as yet to any great, inclusive, generally accepted statements of the Christian religion in terms of our modern thought-world, such as those which availed for the Mediaeval Catholic or the Protestant of the Reformation, to lessen the strain upon our own minds or to supplement the inadequacies of our understanding. And we do not wholly agree among ourselves in our reading of this Jewish-Christian tradition, as to what is essentially true in its interpretation of the universe and of man's part in it, or as to its implications for the life of the individual and of society.

Finally, if we understand our task in some such fashion as I have indicated, we are sure to be faced with the accusation that we are indulging in propaganda. This last difficulty we may perhaps overcome by the methods which we use in presenting our subject and by insisting on recognition of the fact that it has a right to a hearing in the universities and colleges of countries avowedly Christian. And at present we have at our disposal an exceedingly effective apologia for presenting the religion of the prophets and of Jesus to our students. No one who is alive to the modern world doubts the seriousness of the intellectual and moral situation. There is obvious

necessity for some interpretation of the meaning of life, for some ethic and religion, that shall save the race from the disaster consequent upon materialism and self-interest and that shall give the individual light on his path and power to follow it in this dark day. The very dangers of the situation defend the offering of a remedy. Further, the extraordinary need of the modern youth for help in his search for enlightenment, or in his rebellion, or in his discouragement, makes even those of our colleagues who do not share our general point of view favorable to its impartial presentation to our students.

Hence my fourth proposition, which seems to me to mark the most important change of aim or shift of emphasis in the teaching of the Bible in the past twenty years.

4. The Bible, as a source of subject matter to be included in the college curriculum, is chiefly of importance today as a vehicle of religious education.

Before stopping to develop this point, I should like to make another statement, the last, and not the least controversial, of this paper, namely that

5. The primary aim of the college biblical instructor is not merely to use his material for the religious education of his students en masse but to enable the individual student, by means of this discipline, to achieve such adjustment to Reality as we have indicated above, namely a life that is in accord with the best in the Jewish-Christian ethic and religion, as exemplified in the life and teaching of Jesus.

The most advanced position with reference to the aims of biblical instruction in the colleges twenty years ago, might be defined as the acquisition by the student of a body of knowledge, a technique, and a point of view. Instruction was given, as a rule, in the history of the Hebrew people and of the early Christian movement, in the development of religious

doctrines and institutions, and in the Bible as literature, read sometimes in the original tongues. The student was informed, often in great detail, concerning the critical processes by which the positions of scholars were reached and he was himself exercised in their technique. He was led to approach the Bible as he would any other history and literature, studying it for its own sake, with due regard to the evidences of evolutionary development found therein. All parts of the study were based on historico-critical analysis. It was hoped that the student would attain to an intelligent evaluation of the various parts of the Bible for his own day, based upon recognition of their meaning for the day in which they were written. But there was little conscious and concerted effort on the part of biblical instructors to assay the value of specific material for specific ends in the religious education of students, or to develop methods of presentation which would be favorable to the achievement of these ends.

This is entirely understandable in view of the situation from which biblical instruction had so recently emerged—the prevalence of a literalistic, pietistic type of teaching, and of the excitement consequent upon discovery of the results obtainable when the historico-critical method of study was applied to the Bible and the high hopes entertained for the outcome of the further application of this method to the Gospels.

Few persons, trained in modern, scientific methods of Bible study, would find it possible to return to any other. Certainly all of us address ourselves inevitably to that three-fold task. Today, however, can we be content to limit ourselves to it?

The desperate need of modern society forces us to recognize the responsibility of educational institutions to fit their students to interpret the world as a whole and to function successfully in society as creative individuals and as members of creative groups.

Such interpretation and such creative living are the concern of religion. Who in the modern college is more responsible for furthering this conception of education as a religious process than the professional teacher of religion? And if the teacher of the Bible, who has in his hands from certain points of view the most valuable material for religious education that the world has ever produced, fails to discharge his responsibility at this point, who can supply the lack?

The use of the Bible for this purpose is not only rendered defensible but is entailed by the purpose in accordance with which it took form. We accept as a truism the statement that it was not written, as a whole or in part, to convey information on geography, or geology, or astronomy, or any of the sciences. And we bewail the blindness which insists that it must furnish correct scientific information. We grant that even its consciously historical sections in their final form were written to serve what the writers conceived to be moral and religious ends. The literary beauty of certain portions of the records we regard as incidental to the religious purpose and spirit that inform them. We have come to recognize that even the Gospels were written not as biographies of Jesus Christ but to serve missionary purposes. Are we not true to our material, then, only when we utilize it for the ends to which it came into being, namely the religious education of men?

Many teachers in the past, I am sure, while accepting this theoretical position, have considered that such education can best be achieved as a by-product of the presentation of the material for its own sake. As a result, any contribution that the study of it might make to the religious education of students has often been left to chance, the chance of fortunate presentation on the part of the teacher, and of insight on the part of the student into its significance for his own problems.

We recognize that the biblical instructor should be as thoroughly trained as possible in the whole range of studies necessary or important for an understanding of his subject. But that is no longer enough. The really well-trained Bible teacher, today, needs to study each section of the material for its value as a means to the religious education of his students, and to teach it with the aim of making it serve this purpose. It is the exceeding greatness of the Bible that, if it is adequately presented, it lends itself to the full religious education of the individual.

The recent work of this society has been of singular success in clarifying the value of various portions of the Bible for achieving certain phases of this general purpose. We need to go further in the same direction. And we also need much more searching and detailed study of methods of presentation favorable to the attainment of these ends.

Objection may still be raised at this point that the indirect approach is better than the direct in religious education. With this may be associated another objection, that the biblical instructor forsakes his calling when he turns preacher. But this is to confuse ends with means, and the teacher's conscious purpose with the presentation to the student. The student's mind is fixed on the text. If, by skillful teaching, he is enabled to see its meaning for the life of his day and generation, or its universal meaning, this is not to moralize or to throw him into a factitious attitude of seeking everlastingly a possibly extraneous moral. After all, you cannot understand a religious literature without getting at religious meanings, and if we as teachers are ourselves fully conscious of the value of any portion of religious literature for the building up of life and are skillful in adapting methods to material, we need come under neither type of condemnation.

One further important step I indicated

above, namely that the instructor should attempt to adapt his material to the religious education not merely of students, but of the individual student. If he is to do this, he must either make friends of his students or choose such methods of instruction that the problems of individuals will appear in class discussion. Questions of methodology do not come within the province of this paper. Obviously, however, this aim cannot be achieved when one instructor has many students, except by the most careful planning. But that it is the final goal of the teacher of the Bible. I am, for myself, no longer in doubt. Most of us have a clear philosophy of education and convictions as to the place of religion in the educational process. Moreover, we are ourselves persons who interpret life religiously. We have in our hands supremely valuable material for character education and the teaching of religion. And the material is of such a nature that it leads the student to initiate discussion of his gravest personal and social problems. If I have succeeded in presenting my own point of view, it has become evident that, from this standpoint, the end of the educational process, in so far as biblical instructors are permitted to share in it, is the adjustment of the individual to Reality for the achievement of the highest personal and social ends, as seen in the light of the Jewish-Christian tradition and especially of the life and teaching of Jesus. To attempt, as Bible teachers, to escape such an aim and to achieve neutrality, is to attempt the impossible. So long as we present, with the utmost fairness of which we are capable, the various possible attitudes toward any question we are handling, we cannot be accused of propagandizing. We can be true neither to ourselves nor to our students if we fail to make our best knowledge serve them in that which is the highest purpose of education, namely abundance of life.



## THE TEACHING OF RELIGION IN THE LIBERAL ARTS COLLEGE

PROFESSOR DAVID E. ADAMS, *Mount Holyoke College*

ONE cannot hope to undertake the teaching of religion at the college level in quite the same matter-of-fact and direct manner that one would use in the class-room of literature or science. The minute one starts even preparing the field for cultivation, the plow-point is likely to turn up some unexploded dud, buried relic of an ancient theology controversy, the unforeseen explosion of which shatters the equilibrium of sundry individuals and definitely impairs the confidence of some of the class in the instructor.

There is a well-established campus myth that undergraduates are not interested in religion. This is probably due to the fact that their percentage of church attendance is supposed to be nearly as low as that of the general population, and for much the same reasons. Undergraduates are no different from other people. They are as much, or as little, interested in religion as the family or community group from which they come. A low percentage of church attendance is often merely the evidence of revolt against unintelligent leadership and anachronistic forms. It is often a matter of social pressure, and frequently has very little relationship to the question of vital interest in religious problems.

This being the case, it is perhaps not surprising to find that as a matter of fact in many institutions whose curricula include an adequate offering, religion, presented as a serious subject of study with due academic credit, attracts its full share of elective support, and is taken seriously by nearly all who elect it.

Religion is not exactly like astronomy or history or literature. It is far more inclusive, and this is witnessed by the fact that whereas the specialist in religion is rarely expected to lecture upon astronomy or physics, specialists in every other field constantly appear in print and on the public platform with widely varied

interpretations of religion which receive an enthusiastic public welcome. In other fields a definite body of fact can be presented; in the sciences it can be tested by directed observation of processes under control; rival theories can be discussed, and probable conclusions suggested—all with little necessary emotional disturbance in the mind of the student save when he suddenly realizes that in biology or geology or psychology or philosophy or elsewhere there have been quietly developed implications which run counter to the content of what he thinks is his religious faith. Then there is genuine intellectual and emotional disturbance, sometimes disillusionment, and sometimes criticism of the institution, no less bitter for the fact that it is narrow. This difficulty is largely avoided, however, if from the very beginning the student has been led to expect that such will be the case, and has been introduced, even in a very elementary way, to something of the scientific spirit and point of view toward religion itself. But this makes the teaching of religion an extremely delicate and at times dangerous operation, simply because so much depends on it. The division here between the body of fact and the interpretation is especially difficult, because the student does not approach the subject with an open mind, as is the case in a field of study with which he is previously unacquainted.

Frequently genuine unrest and inquiry are aroused by recognition of the fact that childhood teaching and much of traditional church doctrine is intellectually indefensible, especially where it hinges on the assumption of the infallibility of scripture. Let no one say that, confronted with this situation, the modern undergraduate is indifferent. He is far from it. The thing matters intensely. A good deal of the time this questioning runs so deep that students do not even discuss it, ashamed



to reveal their lack of understanding to their fellows. And their reticence is often interpreted as indifference.

What should be the goal sought in the teaching of religion at the college level? While unquestionably the student should emerge with an open mind, that does not mean that he should go forth unfurnished with a philosophy of life adequate to meet his immediate needs and problems with a measurable degree of control and satisfaction. Somehow he needs to have attained an ethical code sufficient for the successful discharge of his immediate social responsibilities, and a moral dynamic powerful enough to make that code effective. Most people find that combination in some form of religion.

That raises the question not only of the content of the teaching of religion but of the philosophy of life for which the college as an institution may be supposed to stand, and that involves the interpretation which is to be placed upon the major problems of existence. For it is generally agreed that the college seeks to develop in the individual student that well-rounded synthesis of knowledge and experience which fits him for intelligent participation in all the life of his day.

Some years ago Dr. Temple, Archbishop of York, said that we can never resist the destructive forces of modern criticism, and what he calls sectionalism, in research, unless we have a generally recognized principle of unity which will explain the phenomena of the physical world, of the human world, and of individual existence, on a single principle. That is doubtless further than most college teachers would go, and yet for practical purposes would it not be a tremendously desirable thing if they could as a group reach a certain measure of agreement, from their different points of view, as to the way in which an educated person might be expected to meet the major responsibilities of life? Too often when people pose as liberals they act as neutrals. And there is

danger that teachers practice in their own fields a narrow dogmatism which throws each particular interpretation of the facts of life so out of relation to other interpretations as to leave the student in hopeless confusion. Each must of course continue to make in his own field that interpretation which his best thinking yields, but it is well to remember that the historian, the scientist, the philosopher, the theologian are, from their different points of view, interpreting the same basic facts and experiences: that there is an underlying unity there which must somehow be recognized and taken into account. From the student's angle the problem is to develop a point of view which recognizes all these diverse interpretations, and yet somehow synthesizes them into a workable personal philosophy.

This cannot be accomplished by a mere series of negations. And so the question is raised whether teachers have not a certain responsibility to try to find and express such a basis of agreement as may be possible among their respective fields, as a foundation upon which all teaching might to a certain extent rest, something which should have more weight than the authority of a single personal opinion, and which as such would give the student the feeling that underneath the differing viewpoints there is a certain solid agreement on fundamental things, to which he can tie as a guide during his more difficult periods of readjustment in the various special fields.

It is commonly stated that biologically speaking the human animal has the two functions of self-preservation and reproduction. But it is obvious that these two primary biological functions cannot be successfully exercised without regard for their social implications: nor can they proceed at all without impinging almost immediately upon every field of knowledge represented in a college curriculum. In other words, life is a unity. For practical purposes, it cannot be divided into

segregated fields. All the new learning has a moral aspect, a spiritual significance. If teachers are irreverent in the evaluation of this significance they soon destroy the student's reverence for truth itself. If he does not see them assuming a constructive attitude toward life as a whole, he will have decidedly less regard for their interpretation of that part in which they pretend to specialize. There is no question that in large sections of the popular mind theological obscurantism is on the increase, largely because the religious liberal is so far ahead of the crowd that they have lost sight of him. But obscurantism is the foe of scientific progress and the denial of freedom. The greatest hope lies in the possible willingness of the educated man to make it very clear that in his use of the new knowledge he is not failing to carry over the fundamental moral and spiritual values of the old, and has not lost the dynamic which gives rise to a high standard of personal conduct and a deep sense of social obligation. This is eloquently witnessed by the social and economic morass into which the world has of late been sinking, simply for lack of any consistent and united effort to relate affairs to adequate ideals.

Sociologists paint the picture of a social and economic utopia. But where shall we find any possible motive for its attainment unless in some way we recognize righteousness either as the attribute of a creative purpose, in harmony with which man finds satisfaction, or as an attribute of man himself to be developed and brought to wise fulfillment in his social relationships? What is there in much of the modern interpretation of life which really offers any constructive solution at all for these recurring problems in which we recognize the progressive break-down of a civilization which was the product, in part at least, of moral and religious ideas regarded by the intellectuals of today as outmoded? Has the liberal arts college a broad, sane, constructive philosophy

of life to offer its students, adequate to the social and spiritual needs of this generation? Can it honestly be said that such is the quality of its achievement at the present time? And if the answer is an affirmative, can it be shown where and how that philosophy is making decisive contact with the student mind?

The empirical approach, the building of the personal religion or philosophy of life upon the attempted solution of needs felt and problems realized, involves for the thoughtful individual some definite view of the world as the basis for the kind of solution which he finds measurably adequate. For some this basis lies in the unifying conception of a purposeful deity immanent in the world process, and comprehending all its parts. For others it lies in the conception of man as in some sense the "supreme being," through his own mental activity unifying and ordering the society which he constructs in the course of his struggle with environment. These two possible viewpoints are not necessarily as flatly contradictory as they are sometimes held to be, for both are but interpretations of the same identical body of fact and experience, the one being a metaphysical conception growing out of experience, the other representing the supposition that metaphysical speculation is comparatively valueless in dealing with human experience. The chief point of discussion lies in the question of motive or dynamic adequate to a realization of the ends in either case regarded as desirable. The theist finds that dynamic in loyalty to what he conceives to be an on-going purpose in the universe, however imperfectly understood. The humanist finds it in the immediate response to human need, wherever found.

But fully granting the diversity of interpretation, and this difference in rationalization of the will to act, the two points of view are nevertheless in remarkable agreement as to the human needs and problems involved, and

as to the solutions desired. There is general recognition of the prime necessity for an ethical use of all the power which the new knowledge has placed within man's control, and we have all deplored the unethical uses of that power which constitute so serious a threat to the immediate future of our civilization.

Can the teachers of today find common ground in the face of modern problems, common ground in a philosophy of life so expressed that students shall recognize in personal living as well as in professional attitudes, constructive leadership and genuine contribution to the solution of the deeper problems of contemporary civilization? Can they compass a "merging of horizons" which will enable their graduates to achieve an integrated philosophy of life satisfactory to themselves and constructively useful in the effort to find their appropriate relationship to society? That such a need is widely felt among undergraduates is not to be denied. A recent graduate said in his commencement oration:\*

Our alma mater, "for all the joy of her instruction, for all her generous opportunities for physical and mental growth, has been either unwilling or unable to impart to her sons a truly moral education. As a liberal college, she has given a complete training in means without particularly troubling over ends. We have absorbed technical knowledge: we know our quadratic equations and chemical formulae; we have absorbed decorative knowledge; we are able to quote what Shakespeare said about music, and what Schopenhauer said about art, but we have in no wise been given a set of social ideals or behaviour norms which we may apply to the external world. In this omission lies the essential failure of the liberal college.

"The liberal college has maintained its

status as a searcher after pure truth, while repudiating its duty of furthering the social ideal. It has guarded well against the great sin of indoctrination, but in so doing has sent out into the world many individuals bewildered and morally incompetent. . . . The best that it has been able to do is to foster a philosophy of negation—to support heartily the demolition of the old order without making an attempt to build solidly and foursquare upon the ruins. The happy fervor with which certain instructors disillusion serious-minded freshmen about love and religion without giving them the materials to construct happily anew, is itself ample justification for our diagnosis.

"American college education today, then, strongly scientific and strongly agnostic in its moral attitude, is sitting on the fence, shy of indoctrination, fearful of being guided by the play of social forces. It refuses to give the resolute and positive guidance in the realm of moral action which is in reality its greatest responsibility."

May it not reasonably be expected that institutions which eschew narrowly vocational aims in education, thereby assume the distinct obligation of giving their graduates this greater thing—not culture alone in the sense of acquaintance with many interesting fields, but some way of relating these fields intelligently to one another, and to the problems of society. Successful post-graduation adjustment depends tremendously on a philosophy of life that can meet disappointment and failure with unembittered equanimity, that can face apparently insuperable obstacles and delays with a courageous attitude. This involves faith in the value of experience itself. It involves faith in human possibilities, in the potentialities of plain folks, given reasonable opportunity. It involves faith in reserves of power within, and perhaps beyond the self. It involves faith in life as worth living at its best, because it is the expression of an abiding

\*Albert William Levi, Jr. "The Failure of the Liberal College" (1932)  
(Subsequently published in *The American Scholar* Vol. II)  
♦BK magazine.



reality that is working toward something whether the goal be seen as the social utopia or the personal victory of the spirit. In the comparative academic seclusion of the campus there is a tendency toward a disillusioned,

gentle cynicism. But this, as Edith Cavell said about patriotism, is "not enough." Somehow a way must be found to empower the crusader spirit on which the progress of civilization depends.

## THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

PROFESSOR CHARLES H. PATTERSON, *University of Nebraska*

IF IT be true as certain philosophers of the present day believe that the most important truths about the universe are those that have to do with its action, that is to say with the quality of its life, rather than its physical structure or the mechanical arrangement of its parts and motions, it follows that the moral and religious experiences of men are of peculiar significance for the construction of a sound doctrine of metaphysics. And if it be granted that the literature of science is of supreme importance for the interpretation of the physical aspects of the universe, it is not unreasonable to suppose that religious literature may be no less valuable for interpreting the world's life.

The advantage which religious literature possesses in this regard lies in its use of those categories which are adequate for moral experience and which can for that reason give meaning to man's life and to the world's life of which he is a participant. Chief among the categories which the literature of religion has employed is that of *drama*. Through the use of this category it has been possible to interpret the world process in terms of its action and to establish as a measure of reality—perhaps its most important measure—the good and the bad as these terms may be used to characterize the quality of living.

It is true that the Old Testament is not usually regarded as a book of philosophy and certainly it is not philosophy if by that term we mean nothing more than a description of the physical factors of the universe and a record

of the mechanisms involved in their behavior. But if by philosophy we mean something that includes the *life* of the world and if with reference to this life we regard the physical universe as a stage the purpose of which is to provide a setting for it, then the Old Testament is a book of philosophy and as such is deserving of our serious consideration.

A very general characterization of the philosophy of the Old Testament which shows at once its contrast with the philosophies of the Greeks is contained in the statement that the approach to reality which the Hebrew writers made was based primarily upon inner experiences of the moral type rather than upon observations concerning the external world. No better illustration of this method of approach can be cited than the way in which the Hebrews arrived at their conceptions of the deity. The method by which they tried to discover ultimate reality stands in striking contrast to those whose interpretations have been based upon observed phenomena of the external world. A brief consideration of these two methods of approach will be sufficient to make the contrast between them clear.

A presupposition of the outward method of approach is that the truth about the world can be discovered only through the use of our reasoning faculties. This is the method which the scientist uses for his explanations of the phenomena of the physical world. Mechanical causation and quantitative measurement are his chief categories and it is in terms of these that the explanations which he offers are



made. The causes of things are to be sought by observing phenomena in the external world and determining in each case the invariable antecedent. This is the method by which the whole structure of our modern physical science has been created. So successful has this method been in the investigation of physical phenomena that it is not at all uncommon to find scientists who claim that it is the only method by which truth can be reached in any realm. But this method falls short when it is applied to other fields than those of the physical sciences. This is especially true with reference to the field of religion. This may be seen when we consider the consequences of this method in regard to the idea of God. For, according to this type of explanation, God is either the mechanical force back of the laws of nature or else our ideas about him have no objective validity. If the first of these alternatives be accepted, the idea of God may be logically adequate but it will not be sufficient to satisfy the moral demands of one's nature. And, if the second alternative be true, it follows that the idea of God is a fiction which had its origin in the superstitions of a pre-scientific age, and the history of religion is nothing more than a record of the way in which man has been gradually but progressively reading it out of his view of the universe.

These consequences, however, do not obtain when the inward method of approach is used. For, in accordance with this method, God is not discovered through any search for mechanical causes such as we find operative in the external world but rather is he to be found by looking within the moral consciousness itself. A presupposition of this method of approach is that truth can be reached through more avenues than one. Reason is one pathway to reality but it is not the only one. The feelings and emotions by which we can experience love, friendship, beauty, moral obligation, and a sense of human dignity and worth,

are also valid instruments for the attainment of truth. And any conception of the universe which fails to give meaning and significance to these experiences will be no less inadequate than one which fails to meet the requirements of reason. This method, which gives emphasis to inward experiences rather than outward phenomena, and which implies that the moral and aesthetic elements in human nature no less than the rational are qualified to give us truth about the world, has enabled men to arrive at a conception of the deity which without doing violence to the demands of reason does at the same time give meaning to the moral requirements of human nature.

That the authors of the Old Testament employed the inward method of approach in arriving at their interpretations of God and the world is evident from any careful consideration of their writings. It was their use of this method that constitutes their great contribution to the field of philosophy. And in this also lies much of the significance of Old Testament for us today. We of the west have long been under the influence of that conception of the universe the pattern of which is given by the categories of mechanical science. It was with the Greeks that this view of the universe first found expression. They were the first to define the real in terms of physical elements and mechanical force. With the decline of their civilization this conception began to wane and during the centuries that followed it was replaced by a religious view of the world. But with the beginning of the modern era, the Greek way of looking at things was revived and with the development of the scientific conception of the universe it became a dominant factor in the thinking of the western world. This modern scientific viewpoint reached its peak during the nineteenth century. The methods and categories of mechanical science were used to explain practically every realm of experience. This conception of the universe, splendid as it was

from the standpoint of the development of science and the investigation of physical phenomena, was nevertheless one in which the spiritual factors of human life could have no legitimate place. The universe of the mechanist is a logical system but it is not a moral one. It gives no meaning to the moral, aesthetic, or religious experiences of human beings. From it there can be derived no sense of history and no appreciation of the meaning of the world's life. The activities of men and of nations cease to have any meaning when human nature is robbed of its dignity and its sense of moral obligation.

It is in contrast with this mechanistic worldview that the approach to reality which one finds in the Old Testament obtains for us its greatest meaning. The Hebrew writers did not arrive at their conception of God by trying to make their ideas of Him conform to some intellectual pattern. Rather they discovered Him through those moral experiences which alone can give meaning and value to human living. Reason they did employ. But they did not identify it with reality. They used it rather as an instrument to guide them in their interpretation of life's most meaningful experiences. It was the experience of love, the feeling of friendship, the sense of moral responsibility, and their conviction of human worth and destiny that constituted for them the basal facts for the making of a philosophy of life. They believed in the existence of a God because they could not think intelligently of love, of justice, and of human worth, apart from someone who knows and cares, and guarantees the value and worthiness of these experiences. It was through the soul of man rather than through the intellect alone that they came to their knowledge of reality.

This inward method of approach finds abundant illustration in the historical writings of the Old Testament. It was the use of this method with its resultant conception of the deity that gave to the Hebrew writers their

sense of the meaning of history. It is a significant fact that although the Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations were both much older than their own, the Hebrews were the first to write a comprehensive history. And the reason for this can be found in their conception of human nature with its idea of moral responsibility and its relationship to a divine plan. Take away the idea of morality as a factor in human life, and history not only loses its meaning but even the recording of events that have taken place becomes a senseless procedure. But for a people to whom the experiences of men and of nations constituted a revelation of the character and will of God, the recording of these experiences was a matter of serious concern. The Hebrews saw in history the working out of a divine plan. History was for them not only evidence of the existence of God but it was an indication of His character. They interpreted the world process in terms of a drama the meaning of which was to be found in the struggle for the realization of the divine purpose. The physical world provided the stage upon which the drama was being enacted and it was as one of the actors on the stage that the Hebrew nation was itself destined to play the most important role. It was from the point of view of the drama as a whole that the activities of individual men and nations were to be viewed and judged. And furthermore it was this conception of a cosmic drama that stimulated the writing of histories and gave meaning to them after they were written.

This was the point of view from which the author of the J narrative (The Great Judean History) wrote his history. He began with an account of creation and continued with the story of Israel's activities down to the time when the monarchy was established. The narrative as a whole reveals one major objective. It is to make clear the divine purpose which, according to the author, is gradually being realized in the affairs of men. This

purpose he identified with the establishment of the Hebrew nation in the land of Canaan. This, he maintains, has been God's plan from the beginning. But its fulfillment has been delayed by a long series of events each one of which has temporarily frustrated the plan. The temptation in the Garden of Eden, the slaying of Abel, the building of the tower of Babel, the wickedness preceding the flood, the barrenness of Sarah, the fact that Rachel the wife of Isaac was likewise barren, the forced flight of Jacob, and experience of the Israelites as they approached the Red Sea, and the many difficulties which they encountered in their march through the wilderness—all of these hindered the realization of the divine purpose. But each difficulty had in some way been surmounted. God's plan could never be ultimately overthrown. Though it was not realized at the time when the author wrote, he was confident that it soon would be. All history was for him evidence of the fact that the divine plan could not be defeated.

In another historical document which has been incorporated in the two books of Kings, the writer sets forth what seems to him to be the supreme lesson of all history, viz., that God prospers the nation that obeys his laws and sends punishment on those who transgress. Our interest in his narrative lies not so much in the particular events which he recorded as it does in the philosophy of history which his writing reveals. History had for him a very definite meaning. He saw in it an explanation for all the varied experiences through which his nation had passed. It could be found in the attitude which the kings had taken toward the Deuteronomic law of the central sanctuary. According to this law the offering of sacrifices along with the performance of other religious rites must be centralized at Jerusalem. Concerning the kings who tried to enforce this law by destroying all of the outlying sanctuaries he says that they did that which was good in the sight of God and

consequently the blessings of their respective reigns were all attributed to the divine favor. But of those kings who permitted the worship to continue in the forbidden places it is said "They did that which was evil in the sight of God." Hence the misfortunes of their reigns were punishments sent by the deity. Beginning with Solomon and including all the kings of Israel and Judah down to the time when he wrote, this is the standard by which they were all judged. It was for this reason that the kings of Israel were without exception pronounced evil and the same explanation is given for the captivity of the Northern kingdom. That the author of this history over-emphasized the importance of this law and that he selected his materials to suit the particular thesis which he had in mind are facts that can scarcely be doubted. But the real significance of his work does not lie in the historical accuracy of his records. It is to be found in the fact that he had a philosophy of history. He believed that the course of events in the life of individuals and of nations is determined not by outward circumstances but by the attitudes which people take toward the laws of God.

This conception of history according to which the destiny of nations is controlled by moral principles finds its clearest expression in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah, Israel's great prophet of the exile. He was not a historian but rather a prophet who had an interpretation of history. He did not believe that events happen by chance. On the contrary he believed that they were determined by moral principles which belonged to the very nature of God. As the champion of monotheism he boldly challenged the heathen nations to show wherein the claims of their gods had ever been vindicated by history. He was sure that they could not do it. They could not point to any universal principles as explanation of the events that had taken place. What a contrast between those gods and the one whom his own



people worshipped! "Remember this and show yourselves men; bring it again to mind O ye transgressors. Remember the former things of old; for I am God and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning and from ancient times things that are not yet done; saying my counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure; calling a ravenous bird from the east; the man of my counsel from a far country; yea I have spoken it, I will also bring it to pass; I have purposed it, I will also do it." (Is. 46:8-11).

Prophecy as well as history reveals the influence of the inward method of approach. It was through this means that the great Hebrew prophets arrived at their conceptions of God. In fact it is the discovery of God through the moral experiences of human beings that characterizes most essentially the prophetic portions of the Old Testament. To appreciate this fact one needs only to look at the work of any of the great prophets. Hosea is a good example. His conception of the deity was the basis for all that he wrote. And this conception was for him the result of a personal experience through which he had passed. According to the record, he had loved Gomer in all sincerity and had married her in the hope of establishing a happy home. But after their marriage she had proved unfaithful to him bearing children that were not his own. Knowing of her unfaithfulness Hosea divorced her and put her away. She went on from bad to worse until she had finally sold herself into slavery. But Hosea still loved her and though she was no longer his wife he could not give her up. So he sought her out and after purchasing her freedom he made provision for her to live by herself for a time. When she was fully restored to her former self he took her back as his wife. It was through this experience that the idea of God came to have a new meaning for Hosea. His love for Gomer which had finally resulted in her restitution was for him a revelation of the character of

God. Just as the rationalist conceives of reality in terms that will satisfy his reasoning faculties, so Hosea thought of God in terms that would give meaning and value to this experience of love. Redemptive love as he had experienced it in his own life was the noblest thing that he knew. And God, he was sure, must be like the noblest and best that was in him. Hence God was conceived as the source of this love and the supreme reality which alone could give permanent meaning and value to it. With this conception of God in mind it was natural for him to reject the ritual as an essential of worship and to express his conviction that God desires "mercy and not sacrifice, and a knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings."

Isaiah's conception of God was reached in a similar manner. Living in Jerusalem during those critical years following the death of king Uzziah, he sensed more clearly than anyone else the injustice of Judah's economic system and the utter disregard of moral principles on the part of her religious and political leaders. His moral sense caused him to denounce the oppression of the poor and the exploitation of human personality. And yet, if these things were wrong there must be some ultimate standard that made them wrong. And for Isaiah that standard could be none other than the character of God. The proof for God's existence he found in the moral requirements of his own nature. The moral character of God was evidenced to him by his own sense of the rightness of social justice and by his feeling of the supreme worth of human personality. This conception of the deity constituted the basis for Isaiah's prophetic work. From it he derived all the cardinal ideas of his book. The god of social righteousness could not be satisfied with worship that was primarily ritualistic. His demands must be those that have to do with the development of moral character. Hence he taught that the realization of the divine purpose in the world



could mean nothing other than the establishment of right relationships between human beings. This according to the prophet was the goal toward which all the movements of history were directed.

The writings of Jeremiah likewise illustrate this method of approach to the fundamental problems of human life. His conception of religion as a matter of the heart in contrast to the older view of obedience to a divine law was an interpretation that grew out of the analysis which he made of his own inner experiences. The same is true of his teaching concerning the new covenant and his insistence upon individual responsibility.

Poetry and short stories in the Old Testament no less than history and prophecy show the influence of a conception of deity that was discovered through the moral processes of human nature. The book of Job which presents so vividly the efforts of a righteous man to find a solution for the problem of human suffering was occasioned by something more than the intellectual difficulties which the situation involved. It was an attempt to find ultimate vindication for righteous living in the midst of a world that is hostile to man's moral nature. And, again, the delightful stories that are related in the books of Jonah and of Ruth constitute eloquent pleas on the part of their respective authors for a conception of God that is consistent with a spirit of tolerance and an attitude of friendliness toward foreign nations.

It is in the Hebrew apocalyptic writings however that the conception of a cosmic drama is given its most definite expression. With the exception of the book of Daniel and certain parts of Ezekiel and Zechariah, these writings are for the most part to be found in the Old Testament Apocrypha. They belong to the late period of Old Testament literary activity. They possess many peculiarities with regard to style and literary form and this

is doubtless one of the reasons why they have been so much neglected. It is true that, as a general rule, they were inspired by local conditions of persecution and suffering and their messages were intended for the comfort of those who were thus afflicted. Their chronologies were not always accurate and their speculations concerning prophetic periods and particular dates have little meaning for other people than those to whom they were first directed. But these are merely matters of detail. The real significance of these writings lies in the Apocalypticist's conception of a world process which gives meaning to the struggle between the forces of good and evil. The genius of these writers consists in their ability to visualize the world process as a whole and to discover in this process its essential meaning. The world process was for them a drama the meaning of which was to be found in the striving of men for the attainment of the good. As they saw it, the strife between the forces of good and evil was cosmic in its proportions. God was on one side of the struggle and arrayed against Him were all the forces of evil. Human beings must by their very nature participate in the struggle, and their destiny is determined by the side which they choose in the conflict.

The philosophy of the Old Testament is the result of an attempt on the part of some of the best minds of a great race to interpret the world from the point of view of those experiences which are most essential for the dignity and worth of human life. Viewed as a complete system of metaphysics, the book which they produced is lacking in many respects. They left quite untouched most of the problems that come in for discussion in books of philosophy. They were not concerned with the questions of change and identity, the ways of knowing, or the laws that pertain to the structure and operations of the physical universe. But they did understand

the significance of man's moral nature and in making this the central factor in their interpretations of the universe they gave to the

philosophies of the world a permanent contribution and one that we of the present day can ill afford to neglect.

## APOCALYPTIC—WRONG AND RIGHT

PROFESSOR GEORGE P. HEDLEY, *Pacific School of Religion*

THE apocalyptic materials within the Bible, especially the books of Daniel and the Revelation, present special problems to the teacher of Biblical Literature. From the days of their writing, respectively under the oppressions of Antiochus Epiphanes and Domitian, they seem always to have occasioned extremes of evaluation and judgment: by some readers they have been given the highest consideration and respect, while by others they have been vigorously attacked or completely ignored. A striking symbol of this situation is the treatment of the New Testament Apocalypse by the fourth-century bishop and historian, Eusebius of Caesarea. Though he has, with reference to the canon, a middle classification of "disputed" books, he does not put our document there; he lists it rather in both of his first and third categories, the "accepted" and the "rejected"!

To this day it seems that Christendom knows no middle path for the Revelation of John, and for the cognate literature. Currently it is read and discussed almost solely in those fellowships and those schools which read and discuss little else. "Fundamentalism" makes its literal acceptance a touchstone of orthodoxy; liberalism has tended to relegate it to outer darkness—as did Luther, who put the New Testament Apocalypse into the appendix to his German Bible, along with the Apocrypha. One party holds that the apocalyptic writings set forth every detail of the future; the other acts on the assumption that they constitute an outmoded survival of a dead past, interesting from an antiquarian standpoint only.

### *What is Wrong?*

It is not difficult for the modern mind to recognize what is wrong with apocalypticism. Its cosmology, with a physical heaven and—apparently—a number of physical hells, is hopelessly that of a pre-scientific day. Its specific predictions never were fulfilled—and never will be, inasmuch as immediacy in time was an essential part of their threats and their promises. (So true is this that one of the familiar canons for dating an apocalyptic writing is the recognition of the point at which it ceases to be true to history, and becomes altogether vague and inexact.) Its materialism seems to us pathetic in itself, and dangerous for the Church: we cannot believe that cosmological disturbances are the major aspects of the coming of the divine kingdom.

More serious than any of these, however, is the ethical inadequacy of apocalyptic. Arising from situations of political, economic and religious despair, it frankly abandons all hope of creating improved conditions by direct and considered human effort. It attributes to God himself the conclusion that "the end justifies the means," and portrays Him as dealing with warriors by warfare, with oppressors by oppression, with the cruel by supreme cruelty. Quite in harmony with its spirit is the now famous declaration that "When Jesus comes again He will be no longer a meek and lowly Galilean, but a Kaiser Jesus, wading through seas of blood." Its dependence upon divine intervention has been made the pretext for toleration of an intolerable social order, its acceptance of the method of force an excuse for ecclesiastical alliance with militarism.

It is only natural, in view of such facts as

these, that persons with scientific training should question the validity of the documents for our own time; that philosophers should discount their serviceable contribution to human thought; that those who consider human values supreme, and right as more than might; should draw away in distaste and so that teachers who are concerned to present the Scriptures in terms of living value should find the apocalyptic documents ill adapted to their major purpose. But ere we throw the material forever into the repository of disused and unusable curiosities, it will profit us to ask whether there is anything *right* about this literature with which so much is patently wrong.

#### *What is Right?*

It should be recognized, first, that apocalyptic brings to us a valuable reminder in its thorough *awareness of evil*. Too often, even in these days of world-wide distress, we take refuge in an easy optimism which is untrue to the facts and fatal to moral advance. All is *not* right with our world, despite the progress of which we are so proud. The seer's scorn of Roman luxury, his hatred of the means by which it was secured, remain a compelling indictment of our own economic order. (In general, one wonders why modern prophets of the social gospel make so little use of the incisive social criticism which appears so frequently in the apocalyptic writings.) The sins of imperialism did not disappear from the earth with the kingdom of Antiochus or the empire of Domitian. The mark of the beast persists in the hooked cross of Hitler and in the *fascies* of Mussolini . . . And we shall never get rid of them by denying or ignoring their existence. We must share with the apocalypticist in his realistic facing of things as they are; only then may we hope to go beyond him in the technique of making them what they should become.

He is right, again, in his faith in the ultimate overthrow of evil, in his *certitude of*

*the victory of goodness* and of truth. We shall disagree with him as to the way in which the New Jerusalem is to be realized—believing that it must be built upward from the earth rather than that it will descend ready-made from Heaven. But have we anything comparable to his assurance that it *will* be realized because it *ought* to be? Do we, the sophisticated Christians of today, share with the almost illiterate writer of II Peter the confident expectation of "a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness"? He and "John"—whoever John may have been—counted on God to work the transformation. An even greater faith is necessary to those who would build the Kingdom by their own fidelity; but this is the faith by which alone the mountains of the wrong shall be levelled to make room for the broad reaches of the City of God.

The primary message of the apocalyptists is their *call to loyalty*—to a loyalty which could transcend all the threats and all the tortures of a Syrian prince or an imperial priesthood. The externals are changed, at least in a degree; no crime inheres today in the "name" of "Christian." The old loyalty, also, is insufficient. We cannot meet the issue by words or by silence, by mere refusal to participate in certain formal practices. But the underlying challenge is the same. The scale of values which we identify as the divine will, the divine truth, demands our all—or nothing. Never can there be compromise. Those who will not bear the mark of the lamb are indelibly stamped with the mark of the beast.

That, unhappily, has been too often the fate of the Church: failing to stand forthrightly for the ideal in all its stringency, it has become the tool of an order which is diabolical in its results if not in its origin. It has been the fate, too, of most of us as individuals: social pressure has driven us from the positions which our enlightened consciences recognized as right, and has made us agents



in the perpetuation of the wrong. On no such terms as these may we, and the world which we would serve, come victoriously through the great tribulation. Not alone by passive endurance, but rather by aggressive action, shall we bring our faith to its consummation in reality. To action of this sort, fruitful in the transformation of our order, the ancient seers challenge us and our students.

The opposition we face is more subtle than that of the days gone by; it threatens the body less, but the heart and soul far more. To us, who are in danger of yielding, to the students, who are in danger of being unaware, there

comes the heartening and challenging call from Maccabean Jerusalem, from the desolation of lonely Patmos: "Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy . . . Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus." Facing the fact of wrong; holding our confidence in the ultimate triumph of the right; maintaining our fidelity through every challenge of a hostile world order: thus, with the seers of old, we may yet behold the holy city, may hope at last to "bring the glory and honour of the nations into it."

### AN APPRECIATION OF THE MIRACLES

PROFESSOR ROBERT HENRY MILLER, *Manchester College*

WHEN the Pharisees and Sadducees asked Jesus for a sign from heaven he said, "An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign." His answer has in view two ways by which a religion may prove itself, by *signs* and by the *moral transformation of life*.

The application of this clear insight of Jesus to our modern religious situation is disturbing. He probably would set very little store by some of the things which have engaged a great deal of our attention. On the other hand he would be greatly concerned about some matters which have seemed to us indifferent. If, as the words of Jesus clearly imply, religion is to prove itself by the moral transformation of life it seems fair to ask, "Does it work?"

Let us suppose, for example, a salesman would have you purchase a machine. You have asked him our question, "Will it work?" He proceeds to tell you that two thousand years ago it did perform some very marvelous feats.

My illustration represents a too prevalent attitude. It is the attitude of those who would propagate their faith upon the basis of what

it is claimed to have accomplished in remote times and places: there are the miracles!

The emphasis upon the miracle stories of the Old and New Testaments involves the weakness of one who rests upon his laurels while he stands comparatively powerless before present needs. Such a position in any area of life except religion would be regarded as utterly unreasonable. There is no reason why religion should be exempted from the same rigorous judgment. If we cannot point to contemporary evidence to vindicate our claims we have no message for our day.

It is claimed that we who regard the miracles, interpreted literally, as an impediment rather than an asset would make of our religion a purely mundane affair. Our answer to this charge is that hope and courage do not require the acceptance of the belief in physical miracles. The faith for which we plead puts all the dynamic suggested in miracle stories into the effort to transform individuals and society after the pattern of the life of Jesus. It spurns the old slogan, "You can't change human nature." It undertakes to change human nature. It holds that man's achievement in the mastery of physical forces can be duplicated in the realm of his moral and



social relationships. It does not ask for the allegiance of men, pointing to what it has done in the past. It sets out to do the one supremely important thing which will save the present day. It seeks to display the power of God not by the authoritative assertion of miracles in a remote past but by working them now.

It may seem that the emphasis of this paper is largely negative, a plea for the discarding of certain beliefs. A negative statement, however, may serve as a forerunner for a positive truth. It is in the interest of concentrating the dynamic of our faith upon the moral problems of the present that it is obviously important to disclaim belief in physical miracle.

In the minimization of the miraculous we shall be following the example of Jesus. The popular reaction to his cures was deeply distasteful to Him. He told those whom He healed to say nothing of it. The net result was to dwarf the moral and social significance of religion. Jesus saw this result in the crowds in Galilee and protested against it. It is "An evil and adulterous generation that seeks after a sign." They are unwilling to allow religious faith to establish its claims through moral renewal.

It would be quite untrue to say that all interest in signs grows out of moral obtuseness such as the Pharisees showed. The principle, however, is fundamental: *the zeal for signs and the zeal for goodness are basically opposed*. The Pharisees whom Jesus addressed manifested it in extreme form. Until we frankly renounce all concern for physical miracles we shall find ourselves greatly handicapped in putting the full force of our religion into the moral struggle of our day.

There remains, however, the question of method. How shall a teacher deal with this problem of miracle? He may frankly deny the historical character of the miracles, but the wise teacher will not view the problem from this one angle alone. The religious faith

of our students is of more vital concern than the immediate and complete presentation of all the conclusions of our researches. To brush aside with one sweeping denial a belief which has been deeply embedded in the faith of a student may demand of him an adjustment which he is not able to make.

The outright denial of miracle is generally an unwise procedure on the part of a teacher because, for one thing, it is purely negative; it takes something away from the student, while it offers nothing in compensation of the loss.

Again, it is pedagogically unwise. It thrusts upon a student a conclusion at which he himself should have arrived by his own mental processes.

If, therefore, a frontal attack in the form of a denial of historical accuracy is not wise, what procedure shall we follow? There is a way of leading students into an understanding and appreciation of miracle stories which will focus attention upon the essential truth so that the question of historical accuracy becomes, first, a matter of comparative indifference, and then is settled in harmony with intellectual integrity. What is that way?

An observation which seems almost trite may open an approach to the answer to our question. In any miracle story we must clearly distinguish two things, *spiritual message* and *physical apparatus*, the *living truth*, and the *vehicle* used to convey it.

Let us look at a few of the miracles in the light that I have suggested.

There is the story of Israel's escape from Egypt and of the five-hundred-mile journey into the land of Canaan. For generations the Israelites had been slaves. Within a period of forty years they broke the shackles of slavery and rose to nationhood and moral consciousness. This achievement of a great people is more wonderful than any of the wonders which crowd the record: the ten plagues, Aaron's rod, the opening of the Red Sea, the sweetened water of Marah, the foun-

tain in the rock at Meribah, the manna, the pillars of cloud and of fire.

Why are these miracles in the record? What are their authors trying to say? In poor prose it might be stated thus, "*Jehovah* broke the might of Egyptian tyranny; *Jehovah* led us through the waste and howling wilderness; *Jehovah* gave us the land of Canaan for a home; *Jehovah* was our helper as we struggled out of bondage into freedom." But mere prose cannot say it. It requires some form of artistic expression to declare this great faith. That artistic expression was found in the miracle story.

The essential truth, however, is eternal. God is the helper of every man who undertakes the steep ascent which the Hebrews made in the Exodus.

Kindle the enthusiasm of your students around this central truth, a truth which is of supreme importance to them, as true today as in Moses' day. The miracles are a kind of picture language to blazon this truth across the centuries.

Having, therefore, gotten these two items, the *miracle* and the *heart of truth* which is in it, clearly distinguished, and set in their right relation, the student is prepared to move forward to a more valid understanding of the miracle. Arriving at this more valid understanding his faith suffers no loss whatever. Essentials have been distinguished from non-essentials, and only in the latter has any change been made. And this change, so far from disturbing and weakening faith, has helped to build up a view of the world in which faith has a vastly increased significance. And for the following reasons:

The orthodoxy which defends the literal interpretation of the miracle stories has a subtle implication which is not always frankly faced. It unwittingly stultifies the faith which it is zealous to defend. In contrast to the experience of men in that ancient time we are isolated from God for He does *not* help us in such direct and effective ways. If God, as

the literalists claim, spoke to them directly and intervened miraculously to help them in difficult situations we must recognize the fact that *we have no such immediate access to His aid*. The long period of experience and training through which God has taken the race has had one adverse result—*His contact with men today is less definite and immediate than it was in the days of the Exodus*. Instead of a progressive revelation we have a progressive alienation of man from God.

There is, moreover, a subtle element of defeatism in this pointing to past marvels. Very often it is unexpressed, even unconscious. But when one has surveyed the miracle stories of the Bible, his mind reverts to his own day and its needs and he says sadly to himself, "Divine help does *not* come to us in this fashion."

The net impression, moreover, arising from the belief that these miracle stories are literal history is a mistaken conception of the manner of Divine intervention in human affairs. Men are led to identify the Divine with the abnormal, the spectacular: it is this sort of thing in modern life which most resembles the ancient miracle stories. Thus the presence of God is drawn away from the common and familiar areas of life, with a loss which is tragic indeed. Pessimism is the inevitable result.

With the increase of scientific knowledge there has been a constant diminution of the place of the apparently capricious phenomena. The occurrences in modern life which are believed to be in the class of the ancient miracles have been and will continue to be of diminishing number and importance. If there alone God is at work, if the abundance of this type of thing is the measure of His kingdom's advance, we are bound to be pessimists. There is profound consistency in the pessimism of those who accept the miracle stories of the Bible as literal history. Such works are *not* done in our day. That was the golden age; we are fallen upon evil times.

In teaching the stories of the Exodus,

therefore, we must keep the major emphasis upon the faith which is common to both them and us, *that God is the Ally of those who wage the war of justice against unrighteousness.*

## COMMITTEE STUDIES RELATING TO BIBLICAL INSTRUCTION IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

### 1. A STUDY IN BIBLE CREDIT FOR COLLEGE ENTRANCE

#### Committee Report\*

FIVE hundred forty-six institutions have been studied by the committee chosen and sponsored by the National Association of Biblical Instructors. Of these institutions four hundred fifty-two were universities and colleges and ninety-five were junior colleges. Of the colleges and universities, three hundred sixty-three, or 80%, grant entrance credits in Biblical study; of the junior col-

leges, seventy-nine, or 83%, grant such credit. Of the total number of all institutions studied 81% answer "Yes" to the question, "Does your institution accept entrance credit for work previously done in Bible?"

A. The colleges, universities and junior colleges granting entrance credit in Bible are here listed alphabetically by states. The numbers in parenthesis indicate the maximum number of units acceptable. One star preceding a name indicates a junior college; two stars following indicate an institution accepting Bible credit as History or Literature.

#### Alabama

Alabama (1)  
Birmingham Southern (1)  
Howard  
Judson (1)  
University of Alabama  
Woman's College of Alabama (1)

#### Arizona

\*Phoenix

#### Arkansas

\*A. M. and N. College  
\*Galloway Woman's College (1)  
Harding (2)  
Hendrix (2)  
\*John E. Brown (2)  
\*Jonesboro Baptist (1)  
\*Little Rock (1)  
Ouachita Baptist  
\*State Agricultural and Mechanical College (1)  
University of Arkansas (1)

#### California

\*Brawley  
\*Chaffey  
College of the Pacific (4)

#### \*Compton

\*Cummock  
\*Fullerton  
La Verne (3)  
Loyola University  
Mills (1½)  
Occidental (3)  
Pacific Union (3)  
Pomona

#### \*San Benito County

Stanford  
University of California  
University of Redlands  
Whittier (3)  
\*Zuba County

#### Colorado

Colorado Agricultural (3)  
Colorado  
\*Colorado Woman's  
\*Trinidad  
University of Colorado  
University of Denver

#### Connecticut

Connecticut Agricultural (3)  
Connecticut (1)  
\*The Junior College of Connecticut

#### Yale\*\*

District of Columbia  
American University (1)  
Catholic University of America (2)  
George Washington  
Trinity (1)  
Washington Missionary

#### Florida

\*Bethuna-Cookman (1)  
Florida State College for Women (1)  
John B. Stetson (1)  
Rollins (1)  
\*St. Petersburg (1)  
University of Florida (1)  
University of Miami (1)

#### Georgia

Emory (1)  
Georgia School of Technology (1)  
Georgia State College for Women (2)  
\*Young B. Harris  
Morehouse  
Paine (1)

\*Presented at the Annual Meeting.



- Shorter (2)  
Spelman  
Wesleyan (1)
- Idaho**  
Northwest Nazarene  
University of Idaho
- Illinois**  
Augustana (6)  
Aurora (3)  
\*Blackburn  
Bradley Polytechnic Institute  
(1)  
Carthage (1)  
De Paul (1)  
Elmhurst (1)  
Eureka (1)  
\*Francis Shimer (2)  
Greenville (1)  
Illinois (3)  
Illinois Wesleyan (1)  
James Millikin (1)  
Knox (6)  
Lewis Institute (1)  
North Central (1)  
Northwestern  
Rockford (1)  
St. Xavier College for Women  
(1)  
St. Viator (2)  
Shurtleff (2)  
\*Terry Hall  
University of Chicago  
Wheaton (3)
- Indiana**  
De Pauw (1)  
Earlham (2)  
Evansville  
Franklin (1)  
Goshen  
Hanover  
Indiana Central (1)  
Manchester (1)  
Marion (1)  
Oakland City  
Purdue (5)  
Notre Dame (3)  
Valpariso
- Iowa**  
\*Chariton (1)  
Columbia (1)  
Cornell  
Drake (1)  
Grinnell (½)
- Iowa Wesleyan (1)  
John Fletcher (1)  
\*Northwestern (1)  
\*Simpson (½)  
University of Iowa (4)  
University of Dubuque (1)  
\*Washington (1)
- Kansas**  
Baker (1)  
Bethany (1)  
Bethel (1)  
\*Central Academy and College  
(6)  
\*El Dorado (2)  
Friends  
Kansas Wesleyan (1)  
McPherson  
Ottawa  
\*Parsons  
Southwestern (1)  
Sterling (4)  
\*Tabor (1)  
University of Kansas  
Washburn (3)
- Kentucky**  
Asbury (2)  
Berea (1)  
\*Campbellsville (2)  
Centre (2)  
Georgetown (1)  
Kentucky Wesleyan (2)  
\*Lindsey Wilson (1)  
Nazareth (1)  
\*Pikeville (1)  
Transylvania (4)  
University of Kentucky (2)\*\*  
University of Louisville (4)  
Villa Madonna (1)
- Louisiana**  
Centenary College of Louisiana  
(1)  
Louisiana  
New Orleans (½)  
Southwestern Louisiana In-  
stitute (1)  
Tulane (1)
- Maine**  
Bates (1)  
Bowdoin (1)  
Colby (1)  
University of Maine (1)
- Maryland**  
\*Blue Ridge (1)  
Goucher (2)  
Morgan (1)
- Massachusetts**  
\*Atlantic Union (3)  
Boston University  
\*Bradford  
Holy Cross (1)  
Massachusetts State (1)  
Mount Holyoke (1)  
Simmons  
Smith (1)  
Wellesley (1)  
Wheaton (1)  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute
- Michigan**  
Adrian (1)  
Albion (1)  
Alma  
Calvin (1)  
Emmanuel Missionary (3)  
\*Flint (3)  
Hillsdale (1)  
Hope (1)  
Kalamazoo (2)  
Michigan State  
Nazareth  
\*Port Huron (1)  
University of Michigan (3)
- Minnesota**  
College of Saint Catherine  
College of St. Thomas (1)  
Concordia (1)  
\*Concordia  
Gustavus Adolphus (4)  
Hamline  
St. Olaf (1)  
St. Paul-Luther  
University of Minnesota (3)
- Mississippi**  
\*All Saints (1)  
\*Gulf Park (1)  
Mississippi College (1)  
Mississippi State  
Mississippi State College for  
Women (½)  
\*Sunflower  
University of Mississippi (1)  
\*Whitworth (1)
- Missouri**  
Central  
\*Cottey

- Drury  
\*Jefferson City (1)  
Lindenwood (½)  
Missouri Valley\*\*  
Park (1)  
Southern Baptist (1)  
Tarkio  
Westminster (1)  
William Jewel
- Montana  
International Union  
Montana State
- Nebraska  
Dana (1)  
\*Luther (4)  
Midland  
Municipal University of Omaha (3)  
Nebraska Central (1)  
Union (4)  
University of Nebraska (3)
- New Hampshire  
University of New Hampshire
- New Jersey  
Brothers College of New Jersey (1)  
\*Centenary Collegiate Institute (1)  
\*Sarah Lawrence
- New Mexico  
College of Agricultural and Mechanical Arts (1)  
University of New Mexico
- New York  
Alfred (1)  
Barnard (1)  
Colgate (1)  
Mount St. Vincent (1)  
New Rochelle  
Columbia (1)  
Cornell (2)  
Elmira (½)  
Hartwick (1)  
Hobart (1)  
Houghton (½)  
Keuka (½)  
Manhattan (1)  
Rensselaer Polytechnic  
Saint Bonaventure (2)  
Skidmore  
Syracuse (½)  
Union (1)
- University of Buffalo (1)  
University of Rochester  
Vassar (1)  
Wells (1)
- North Carolina  
Atlantic Christian (1)  
Bennett College for Women (2)  
\*Campbell (2)  
Davidson (1)  
Duke (1)  
Elon (1)  
Flora MacDonald (2)  
Greensboro (2)  
Guilford (1)  
High Point (1)  
Lenoir Rhyne (1)  
\*Louisburg (2)  
\*Mars Hill (1)  
Meredith (1)  
\*Mitchell (2)  
No. Car. College for Negroes (2)  
Queens Chicora (2)  
Salem (1)  
Shaw (1)  
University of North Carolina (1)\*\*
- North Dakota  
Jamestown  
North Dakota Agricultural (1)  
University of North Dakota (1)
- Ohio  
Antioch  
Ashland (1)  
Baldwin-Wallace (1)  
Bluffton (3)  
Cedarville (1)  
Wooster (1)  
Denison (1)  
Flora Mather  
Heidelberg (1)  
Hiram (1)  
Kenyon  
Marietta (1)  
Miami  
Mount Union (1)  
Muskingum  
Oberlin (2)  
Ohio Northern (1)  
Ohio University  
Ohio Wesleyan (2)  
Otterbein (1)
- University of Toledo (1)  
Western  
Wilmington (1)
- Oklahoma  
Bethany-Peniel (1)  
\*Cameron State Agricultural Catholic (2)  
Oklahoma A. and M. College (2)  
Oklahoma Baptist (1)  
Oklahoma City (1)  
Oklahoma College for Women (1)  
Phillips University (1)  
University of Oklahoma (1)  
University of Tulsa (1)
- Oregon  
Albany (2)  
Linfield  
Oregon State  
Pacific (1)  
Reed (1)  
University of Oregon  
Willamette
- Pennsylvania  
Allegheny (1)  
Beaver College for Women (1)  
Bucknell  
Carnegie Institute of Technology\*\*  
Cedar Crest (1)  
Elizabethtown  
Geneva (1)  
Grove City  
Haverford (1)  
Juniata (1)  
Lebanon (1)  
Lehigh (1)  
Moravian College for Women (1)  
Muhlenberg  
Pennsylvania State  
Seton Hill (1)  
Swarthmore (1)  
Washington and Jefferson  
Waynesburg  
Wilson (1)
- Rhode Island  
Brown University  
Rhode Island State
- South Carolina  
Anderson (1)

- Clemson  
 Coker (1)  
 Converse (1)  
 Furman (1)  
 Greenville Woman's College (2)  
 Limestone (1)  
 University of South Carolina (1)  
 \*Wessinger Springs (2)  
 Winthrop (1)  
 Wofford (3)
- South Dakota**  
 Augustana (6)  
 Sioux Falls (1)  
 South Dakota State College of A. and M. Arts  
 State School of Mines  
 University of South Dakota (½)  
 Yankton (4)
- Tennessee**  
 Bob Jones (1)  
 Carson-Newman (2)  
 Fisk (1)  
 Knoxville (½)  
 Maryville (2)  
 Southwestern (1)  
 Tennessee Polytechnic  
 Union University (1)  
 University of Chattanooga (1)  
 University of the South (1)  
 University of Tennessee (1)  
 Vanderbilt (1)
- Texas**  
 Abilene (1)  
 A. and M. College of Texas (1)  
 Austin (1)  
 Baylor College for Women (1)  
 Baylor University (1)  
 College of Industrial Arts (1)  
 Daniel Baker (1)
- \*Gainesville (1)  
 Howard Paine (1)  
 Incarnate Word (1)  
 \*Jacksonville (1)  
 \*John Tarleton Agricultural (1)  
 McMurray (1)  
 Our Lady of the Lake (1)  
 \*Paris (1)  
 \*St. Philips (1)  
 Simmons University (1)  
 \*Southampton (4)  
 Southern Methodist (1)  
 Southwestern (1)  
 \*Temple  
 Texas Christian (4)  
 Texas College of Arts and Industries (1)  
 Technological College (1)  
 University of Texas (1)  
 \*Wayland Baptist (1)  
 \*Weatherford (½)
- Utah**  
 Brigham Young University (1)  
 \*College of St. Mary of the Wasatch (3)  
 \*Dixie (1)  
 \*Snow (1)  
 University of Utah (1)  
 \*Westminster (1)
- Virginia**  
 \*Averett  
 Bridgewater (1)  
 College of William and Mary (1)  
 Hampden-Sydney  
 Hampton Institute (1)  
 Hollins  
 Lynchburg  
 Mary Baldwin (3)  
 Randolph-Macon (2)
- Randolph-Macon Women's (1)  
 Roanoke (1)  
 \*Shenandoah (1)  
 Sweet Briar (1)  
 University of Richmond (1)  
 University of Virginia (1)  
 \*Virginia Intermount (1)  
 Virginia Polytechnic  
 Virginia Military  
 Virginia State College for Women (1)  
 Virginia Union University  
 Washington and Lee (1)
- Washington**  
 College of Puget Sound  
 \*Pacific Lutheran (2)  
 Seattle Pacific (1)  
 Spokane  
 State College of Washington  
 Walla Walla (3)  
 Whitman
- West Virginia**  
 \*Alderson-Broaddus  
 Bethany (1)  
 Davis and Elkins (2)  
 \*Greensboro (2)  
 Morris Harvey (2)  
 \*Potomac State (1)  
 Salem (2)  
 West Virginia State (1)  
 West Virginia University (1)  
 West Virginia Wesleyan (3)
- Wisconsin**  
 Beloit  
 Carroll  
 Lawrence  
 Milton (2)  
 Milwaukee-Downer (1)  
 Mission House  
 Northland (2)  
 Ripon

B. A summary of the conditions on which entrance credit in Bible is recognized.

1. Three hundred thirty institutions will grant credit for Bible courses in preparatory schools that are on a par with other curriculum courses.

2. One hundred nine definitely indicate and most of the other schools accepting credit imply that the work must be done in schools

accredited by the State Department or some other duly constituted authority.

3. Seventy-four approve of Church School credit courses with instructors, examinations and standards approved either by the college faculty, state board of control for Bible study, the head of the secondary school, diocesan authorities, regional crediting associations, council of church boards of education, state



department of education, International Council of Religious Education, or other crediting agency.

4. Bible is included among the electives for entrance in at least seventy-one institutions. This basis is rather typically stated by the University of Chicago: "Bible is acceptable here as an elective under the following clause: 'The four or five electives may be selected from any senior high school subjects accepted by an accredited school on its diploma'."

5. Special credit for Bible will be granted by Goucher, Lehigh and others even though the course is not listed for entrance.

6. Some examination plan is used or favored by one hundred institutions. Seventy-seven of those granting credit are interested in college entrance board examinations. Practically, examinations are given by the college, by a state committee (as in Maine), or by a group of colleges (as is the case with Mount Holyoke, Smith, Vassar and Wellesley).

7. Bible courses may be included in the material for evaluating the achievement record of the applicant.

8. Seven institutions designate preparatory schools from which students may enter with credits in Bible.

9. In no case reported is credit given for other than non-sectarian courses.

10. In MacPherson, Georgetown, Wheaton (Mass.) and Wilson each case is brought before the curriculum committee and action is taken on the merits of the work done. The registrar of Wilson College writes: "When a

candidate asks for credit in a course in Bible, the course of study is carefully considered by the Committee on Admission. If found satisfactory, credit for the course is given by certificate or examination, depending upon the method by which credit is obtained for other courses."

11. Twelve institutions demand certification in Bible courses.

12. Courses in Bible are entered as units in History, Literature or Social Science in at least eight institutions, including Yale, the Universities of Kentucky and South Carolina, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology.

13. Credits are received quite freely from secondary schools that merit the confidence of the colleges and universities in the instructor, standards, and quality of instruction in the courses.

14. Closely linked to the preceding basis is the tendency to accept a course which is organized and taught as other high school or preparatory school courses and included among the units for graduation.

15. Junior colleges follow much the same method as colleges and universities for graduation or completion certificates from the Junior College only. For students who plan to transfer at the end of their course the authorization of the higher institution to which the pupil is to go is sought before credit is granted.

C. The colleges, universities and junior colleges reporting the non-acceptance of entrance credit for work previously done in Bible are:

Arizona  
University of Arizona

California  
California Christian College  
\*Long Beach  
\*Pasadena  
\*Riverside  
\*Santa Rosa  
\*San Mateo

Colorado  
Colorado School of Mines

Connecticut  
Trinity  
Wesleyan  
District of Columbia  
Howard University

Florida  
\*Palmer

Georgia  
Martha Berry  
Mercer

Hawaii  
University of Hawaii  
Illinois  
\*La Salle-Peru-Oglesby  
McMurray College for Women  
Indiana  
St. Mary's  
Iowa  
\*Fort Dodge  
Penn  
Upper Iowa

Kansas	Nevada	Oklahoma
Marymount	University of Nevada	*Penn Hall
Mount St. Scholastica	New Hampshire	Oregon
Saint Benedict's	Dartmouth	Pacific University
Kentucky	New Jersey	Pennsylvania
*Caney	Saint Elizabeth	Albright
Maryland	Rutgers	Bryn Mawr
Hood	Seton Hall	Misericordia
Johns Hopkins	Stevens Institute	Dickinson
United States Naval Academy	New York	Drexel Institute
Washington	Adelphi	Franklin and Marshall
Massachusetts	Brooklyn	Lafayette
Harvard	City of New York	Pennsylvania College for Women
Radcliffe	Sacred Heart	Pennsylvania Military Academy
Springfield	D'Youville	St. Joseph's College
Tufts	Hamilton	St. Francis' College
Williams	Hunter College	St. Thomas' College
Michigan	Nazareth	Susquehanna
*Bay City	New York University	University of Pennsylvania
College of the City of Detroit	State College of Forestry	University of Pittsburgh
University of Detroit	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	South Carolina
Minnesota	United States Military Academy	Presbyterian College at Clinton
Carleton	Wagner Memorial Lutheran College	Tennessee
St. Scholastica	North Carolina	Lambeth
*Duluth	*Brick	Lane
Mississippi	Livingstone	Texas
Blue Mountain	Negro Agricultural and Technical College	Rice Institute
Mississippi Women's	Ohio	St. Mary's Institute
Missouri	Adelbert	*Schreiner Institute
*Hannibal-LaGrange	Case School of Applied Science	Trinity
*St. Joseph	Findlay	Wiley
*The Principia	John Carroll	Vermont
Montana	Lake Erie	Middlebury
Montana School of Mines	University of Akron	University of Vermont
Nebraska	Wittenberg	Washington
Hastings		University of Washington
York		Wisconsin
		University of Wisconsin

D. Why do institutions of higher learning not grant entrance credits for Biblical courses?

1. The granting of credit for such courses has not even been considered by the following institutions:

University of Arizona	Hastings	Franklin and Marshall
California Christian College	University of Nevada	Susquehanna
*Cummock Schools	College of St. Elizabeth	University of Pittsburg
University of Hawaii	Hunter College	Lambuth
Upper Iowa University	Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn	Rice Institute
College of the City of Detroit	Lake Erie	St. Mary's University of San Antonio
*Duluth	University of Akron	Carroll
*St. Joseph	Albright	

In practically every case the amount of credit was so negligible that there was no problem calling for a solution.

2. There is no plan for college entrance board examinations. Harvard, Trinity (Conn.), Tufts, Williams, Dickinson, and Franklin and Marshall would grant such credit if these examinations could be used.

3. Junior colleges seem more uncertain than colleges or universities for they want to accept entrance credits recognized by institutions to which students are later to transfer. Riverside and Santa Rosa (Calif.), Fort Dodge (Iowa), Bay City (Mich.), Hannibal-La-Grange (Mo.), and St. Joseph (Mo.) definitely state this objection. (But the state universities of California, Iowa and Michigan are ready to accept such credit.) Also Schreiner (Texas) objects on the same grounds while the University of Texas is ready to grant credits.

4. Four institutions interpret the state law as forbidding them to accept such credit. These are three California Junior colleges, Pasadena, Salinas and San Mateo, and the University of Washington. (It is significant that the other California institutions reporting do not so interpret the law.)

5. Palmer College (Fla.) and St. Benedict's College (Kansas) object on the grounds that they are governed by the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools.

6. Susquehanna is waiting for a recognized practice approved by the best institutions.

7. Instead of offering entrance credits Wesleyan University (Conn.) and McMurray College for Women (Ill.) prefer to give special consideration to cases as they arise. The president of McMurray writes: "We would be glad to accept entrance credits in Bible for courses given in secondary schools which were on a par with other curriculum courses." The Wesleyan position is described by President McConaughy: "We do not give

admission credit for work in Bible. We do, however, in certain cases give consideration to special work, not officially listed for admission, such as Economics and General Science; in this category the committee would, I think, give consideration to admission credits for work in Bible."

8. Certain colleges (as Bryn Mawr, Washington College (Md.), Hood and Rutgers) make definite requirements for all fifteen units or otherwise express a preference for work in established fields other than Biblical study.

9. Credits from parochial schools are quite generally refused.

10. In schools of religion, especially Catholic institutions, religious courses are regarded as over and above the requirements in the secular subjects. "Although a large number of students come to us with credit for Bible courses taken in preparatory schools, we do not allow this credit to be substituted for our entrance requirements," writes the Dean of the College of the Sacred Heart (New York) and Sister Marie, Dean of Nazareth College (Rochester, N. Y.), further explains; "We are not willing that the secular training of our students be less than those of secular institutions, hence our courses in religion, while required for graduation, are over and above (the usual requirement)."

11. Instruction in Bible on the preparatory school level is not on the same high plane as in other courses presented for college entrance. Penn (Ia.) states that "it is unworthy of recognition by the colleges." Registrar Arnsdorf of New York University also well describes the position of Findlay, Hamilton and other institutions when he says, "It would seem logical to assume that, if work in Bible were offered in a recognized secondary school on a par with other subjects as regards qualitative and quantitative requirements, a unit of the subject might receive the same consideration as a unit in any other subject, pro-



vided the customary distribution of the units offered for admission were not seriously disturbed." A pointed and constructive criticism is expressed by Dean Joseph C. Flynn, S. J., of the University of Detroit:

"Our opposition to credit for Bible Study at the high school level is based on the lack of three essentials:

(A) The instructor must have a bachelor's degree from a recognized college, the equivalent of four years of training in Bible Study, at least five years of experience in high school teaching, or working under a head who has had this experience.

(B) The content of the courses must show tangible objectives for each semester and year, must be cumulative, must not be pietistical or emotional, must be objective, not subjective.

(C) The method of teaching must be scientific."

#### E. Concluding Comments.

1. Several other institutions that answered "No" as to accepting credits are more open minded and friendly about receiving such credits than the first records would indicate. This may be presented best by quoting a few notes from the questionnaires or commenting briefly on the policy of particular institutions.

New Mexico Military Academy will accept credits if the courses are "taught and administered as other high school subjects, offered in the elective group and accredited." So also will \*Brick, Martha Berry, St. Mary's College, York, and others.

Wittenberg votes "No" but says that if courses are presented from an accredited school of a denominational character with instructors and courses approved they will accept at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  unit if the same is in addition to essential units.

College of the City of New York: "The administration would accept Bible credits if approved by the faculty, for entrance."

Dartmouth: "Men entering by 'Honor' Certificate could study the Bible course." (Under the new Dartmouth plan students have almost unlimited freedom in electives for entrance.)

Rutgers: "We would not object to one unit being offered if the candidate has fully met the regular requirements to the extent of 15 units."

Hastings: "Such credits would be determined when the situation arose."

Montana State School of Mines: "We have no objection whatever. The State Board of Education would have to approve the acceptance."

The Mississippi Woman's College will consider the acceptance of Church School credits with instructors and courses approved by the State High School Accrediting Commission.

Upper Iowa: "If they were offered they would probably be treated on the same basis as social science credits, viz. limited acceptance."

Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn: "Under certain conditions it might be considered under electives in History or Literature." So also the University of Akron. Lane would list it as "Sacred History."

Adelbert: "It might be accepted as an elective credit to a total of not more than 1 unit if applicant would otherwise lack the required 15 units, and if high school gave credit for Bible toward requirements for graduation."

Colorado School of Mines: "If a student meets all other entrance requirements we will accept an equivalent credit in Bible as an elective or in lieu of one credit in history."

Hunter College: "We could not decide this question unless we had reason to believe that the subject would be offered by some applicants. At present it is never offered."

Mercer: "We are not necessarily opposed to credit for Bible. It is not offered in the state to any great extent."

Lake Erie: "The question has not arisen with us, but we should, I am sure, be entirely

willing to fall in with the policy of any considerable number of the best institutions."

Carlton: "One unit would be accepted as part of 16 entrance units if courses are known to be on a par with other curriculum courses."

Presbyterian College (S. C.): "On examination covering ground claimed."

Middlebury: "We do not favor giving credit until the Bible courses in secondary schools are better organized. Our committee would probably be willing to consider giving credit when convinced that the work is on a par with Mathematics, English, etc."

Saint Mary's University of San Antonio: "If your term 'Bible' includes other forms of religious instruction such as that given in Catholic high schools the administration is heartily in favor of admission credit."

La Salle-Peru Junior College: "If a course in Bible study succeeds in teaching a student how to read discriminatingly and appreciatively, develops the habit of study and reflection, and inspires collateral reading, it will be as valuable as more commonly accepted credits in history and literature. If on the other hand it is a mere absorption of sectarian dogma it may be worth nothing as a preparation for college study."

These excerpts by no means exhaust the favorable replies from the 19% that voted "No" on the questionnaire. When one considers both the institutions definitely committed to the acceptance of Bible credits and the institutions that are open to a decision, and even kindly disposed toward the reception of such credits, it would seem that approximately 95% of all institutions studied are inclined to look with favor on high grade secondary school courses in Bible.

## 2. The Catholic Situation.

The change in attitude on the part of Catholic institutions has been marked since this study was begun. Convinced that "the study

of Religion would be greatly improved if courses in Religion were awarded credit similar to the credit given to other subjects" a letter was sent in February (1933) under the auspices of the Journal of Religious Instruction to the superintendents of Catholic Schools in the United States making inquiries about the granting of university credits. They also wrote to the five largest crediting organizations in the United States, with replies received from all except the New England Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. These replies were published in the October (1933) number of the Journal of Religious Instruction (pp. 183ff.) "None of the four associations replying had ever legislated against recognizing credit in Religion," wrote Professor Ellanay Horan of De Paul University. He further stated in the same number of the Journal of Religious Instruction (October, 1933):

"The excerpts quoted above seem to indicate that it would not be difficult for Catholic secondary education to procure credit recognition for its courses in Religion. During the present year it is our intention to study this question from the attitude of the leading non-Catholic universities in the United States. The following quotations, from three different superintendents of Catholic Schools, are pertinent to the question:

"It is surprising the way the state co-operates."

"I am sure that, if the N. C. E. A. could develop its own standards and apply them validly, our State Boards would allow us to add 3 or 4 credits in our certification. Our difficulty is very much of our own household."

"In regard to religion credits, the question has been passed over by Catholic authorities . . . I am of the opinion that the university would give credit, if the matter were presented to them."

Professor Horan has asked for and received the findings of our committee.

### 3. The Challenge to the preparatory and secondary schools.

A many-sided opportunity confronts the schools on the pre-college level. An overwhelming number of institutions of higher education stand ready to give credit for work well done. Certain preparatory and church schools have already gained the confidence of the colleges. Catholic schools are keenly and increasingly interested in the project. Colleges are inclined to grant greater freedom in secondary school electives. Education feels the need of great literature and inspiring personalities. And all of these are in evidence in a generation increasingly aware of the fundamental worth of the teachings of the Hebrew prophets and Jesus. With the motive, interest and felt-need present in colleges and universities in all parts of the country, there is a challenging opportunity for the preparatory schools and other agencies accredited to teach religion to prove worthy and willing to teach the Bible to the oncoming generations of college youth, as well as to the much larger group that will not have the opportunity for a college education. It is to this new crusade that this report is dedicated.

Claudine Clemens

S. B. Knowlton

Herbert L. Newman, Chairman

## 2. A STUDY OF INSTRUCTION IN BIBLE IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS

### Committee Report

This study was sponsored by the National Association of Biblical Instructors and developed as a part of the investigations of a committee chosen "to study the matter of credits for work in the preparatory schools toward college entrance."

Of the questionnaires sent to the preparatory schools sixty-eight have been returned.

Fifty-seven give instruction in the Bible. In all but four of these the subject is required.

Schools reporting are here listed by states. Those marked with an asterisk have the subject optional. Those marked with a double asterisk have an exception to the requirement in the case of Catholics, etc.

These schools report "yes" on the question, "Do you give instruction in the Bible in your school?":

Connecticut: The Choate School,\*\* Kingswood School, Miss Porter's School, Westminster School, Westover School.

Maine: Higgin's Classical Institute, Kent's Hill School, Maine Central Institute, Oak Grove Seminary, Ricker Classical Institute.

Maryland: Oldfield's School.

Massachusetts: Buckingham School, Cushing Academy,\* The Fessenden School, Miss Hall's School, Inc., House in the Pines, Milton Academy, Lawrence Academy, Mount Hermon School, Northampton School for Girls, Walnut Hill School, The Winsor School.

North Carolina: The Ashville School, Campbell College, Mount Vernon Seminary.

New Hampshire: Phillips Exeter Academy,\* St. Paul's School, Tilton Academy.

New Jersey: Blair Academy, Dwight School for Girls,\* Moorestown Friend's School.

New York: Cazenovia Seminary,\* The Knox School, The Masters School, Silver Bay School, The Spence School, Inc.,\*\* The Stony Brook School.

Pennsylvania: Dickinson Seminary, Ferrum Training School, Friend's Central School, Germantown Academy, Germantown Friend's School, The McCallie School, The Ogontz School,\*\* Westtown School, Miss Wright's School.

Rhode Island: Moses Brown School, St. George's School.

Texas: Baylor, San Marcos Baptist Academy.

Vermont: Montpelier Seminary.\*\*

Virginia: Chatham Hall, The Madeira School,\*\* St. Catherine's School, Stuart Hall.

Schools that do not offer courses in the Bible are:

Connecticut: Kent School.

Maine: Foxcroft Academy, Coburn Classical Institute.

Massachusetts: Belmont Hill School, Deerfield Academy, North Shore Country Day School, The Rivers School.



## Association of Biblical Instructors

81

New York: Albany Academy for Girls, Horace Mann High School for Girls.

Texas: Schreiner Institute.

At Kent School, the Headmaster gives a "Sacred Studies" course once a week to each class. It is not primarily Bible Instruction but deals with all phases of religion and life in general. Foxcroft Academy is a community high school. Coburn Classical Institute had Bible as a required course for several years, but due to financial condition there is at present no Bible instructor. The Schreiner Institute does not at present offer Bible in the high school department even though it retains affiliation for one unit of credit with the State Department of Education. The Institute does offer six semester hours of Bible in the Junior College.

Forty schools affirm that the courses in Bible count toward graduation. Twelve schools do not give credits in Bible toward graduation, even though eleven of these require Bible Study as a part of the curriculum. Only seventeen count courses in Bible for admission to college. Twenty-seven definitely say "No" to the question on college admission. The value of credits varies from one-fourth to two units; the majority indicates one unit as the credit allowed.

Forty-three schools give grades for work in the Bible. The grades are determined in forty-one of these by both recitation and examination. Only two schools state that no grades are granted for work done in the Bible.

Instructors in Bible vary greatly in training and experience. Thirty-three have been specially trained for teaching religion. Twenty-two faculty members not specially trained for teaching Bible have these courses. In seven schools someone not a member of the faculty is called in for the courses in the Bible. Seventeen teachers report an average of 18.3 years experience in teaching the Bible.

In teaching Bible is the emphasis mainly literary, historical, or religious? Nineteen

teachers keep a balance in all three emphases. Seven teachers stress the religious, and the same number combine the literary and historical approaches. One teacher approaches the Bible from the literary angle only, while eight instructors turn aside from the literary emphasis. Two schools make the historical the only approach; two other schools ignore the historical in Bible teaching. Three other emphases—the sociological, ethical, and philosophical—are mentioned respectively by three other schools.

A great variety of text books and books for reference are used. Several instructors have shared their detailed plans for their courses in Bible. Nineteen institutions mention the Bible as the text book. One hundred sixty-seven books are listed as those used in the study of the Bible in the schools reporting. The books most frequently mentioned are the Purinton texts (published by the Charles Scribner's Sons). Three schools say that they have not used the N. A. B. I. outlines in preparing their courses; five instructors say that they have found these outlines useful.

Do you think that instruction in Bible reacts favorably upon the character of your pupils? Thirty-two say "yes," and two "no." A great variety of opinion is expressed, with modifications even by those who express themselves affirmatively or negatively. Such expressions as these are typical: "Hard to answer," "One hopes so," "Not heavily," "Not particularly," "Depends largely on the personal factor," "Depends on teacher," etc. Some comments should be helpful: "An hour a week will not make a boy holy; we submit the Bible as a distinct help." "My teaching can have no good until and unless I can rid my pupils' minds of the idea that religion is merely a matter of learning a creed (which they don't and can't understand) or attending some church (which most of them dislike to do). I am trying to expound the simple teaching of the Christian Gospel as a beautiful and practical way of life." "I do not believe

that the compulsory study of the Bible improves a person's character. On the contrary, many times it has the opposite effect than the one desired—Bible is taught as an everyday affair, as a matter of course, the idea being that everyone should be exposed to the instruction and in the long run be better informed for the maturing faith of an adult." "Yes, when it is given in such a way as to link up with the life and problems of scholars, and to require original thinking and decision." "Ethical questions constantly come up as in other great literature." "I seem to be able to discover better in Bible class than any of my other contacts just what a girl is thinking about." "It encourages one to take stock of his moral standards and to formulate a personal standard which action checks the dangerous policy of drift. It points out the pitfalls of all generations and the milestones of progress. Finally the Bible is a storehouse full of spiritual wealth, advice and principles which substantiate and buttress the natural good intentions inherent in young people." "In many classes and individual pupils the work leads to greater reverence and earnestness and trust in the application of religion to life." "An effort is made to relate the work of the text to the definite school situation. It is hoped that this may stimulate clearer thinking on school problems."

A statement by the late Principal Speer of Mount Hermon epitomizes many of the convictions expressed as to the relation of Bible teaching upon character: "In general, and except in occasional instances, I feel that instruction in Bible reacts favorably on the character of the pupils. By questionnaires to the entire student body, and by personal papers from selected Seniors we have found that instruction in Bible is favorably regarded and deemed a good thing."

Would you like to see Bible among the subjects for which the College Entrance Boards sets examinations, with a unit value on a par with other subjects? Twenty-five schools say

"yes"; eighteen definitely say "no"; the rest are neutral. Twenty-three schools say that they would be likely to present pupils for them. Eleven schools estimate a probable total of 203 pupils who may be expected to take the examinations. Ten schools say that no pupils will appear, and more than half the schools reporting make no comment as to their procedure even if examinations are set.

Most of those replying favorably on the C. E. E. B. make no comments. A few would regard such examinations as an attempt to place Bible on a par with other subjects.

Several objections are made to College Entrance Board examinations in Bible. Each of these objections is expressed by one or more, but not a majority, of the schools reporting.

- (1) Bible courses are so crowded for lack of time that the students are not prepared.
- (2) There are more candidates offering Bible for colleges which accept by certificate.
- (3) The number requiring such examinations is small.
- (4) Examination in Bible should be in connection with English, History, or some other subject.
- (5) Courses in Bible enter into the total achievement record of the student entering college. Such examinations, then, are increasingly unnecessary.
- (6) Courses in preparatory schools are planned with reference to the majority of students and not simply for those who are to take the examinations.
- (7) Regents' or regional examinations are more satisfactory.
- (8) There is no one text that gives adequate material.
- (9) The preparation of a satisfactory examination for many schools is difficult. One says: "It seems to be the one subject which the schools feel that they must be free to teach as they are able and as they will without regard for

syllabus for College Entrance Board examinations."

Having presented the facts found in the questionnaires the committee proceeds to draw the following conclusions:

- (1) The Bible is much more generally taught in private and denominational secondary schools than is popularly supposed, and that the courses are not, as a rule, optional but required.
- (2) Colleges and universities are far more willing to receive credits in Bible than preparatory schools are to grant them for entrance to college.
- (3) Courses in Bible are discounted if required without credits being given on a par with other subjects.
- (4) The teachers of the Bible in secondary schools are generally trained for the work, though the training in most cases is not highly specialized.
- (5) The character of the instruction varies greatly according to the purpose of the courses, the interests and equipment of the instructor, and the opportunities and facilities allowed by the curriculum.
- (6) Several of the secondary schools find no difficulty in having credits for Bible accepted as entrance units to college. This is in accordance with our findings that practically all colleges and universities will accept Bible for admission as soon as they are convinced that the preparation is sufficient, thorough, and on a par with other subjects.
- (7) There is a strong desire on the part of certain secondary schools to make the study of the Bible worthy of recognition by the colleges. In several institutions, however, the pressure of other subjects either forces it out of the curriculum altogether or gives it a minor place.
- (8) A marked tendency is to relate the Bible to the problems of modern life. Especially is this seen in broader courses in religion which include, but are not limited to, the Bible.
- (9) The N. A. B. I. Syllabus on Bible study is not filling any large place in school instruction. It needs wider circulation or revision if it is to be useful.
- (10) The texts and reference books used are widely scattered. A complete list of those suggested may be obtained from the secretary-treasurer of the N. A. B. I. This list may profitably be revised, enlarged, divided into topics, and printed for general distribution.
- (11) Only a beginning has been made by the secondary schools in winning the confidence of the colleges in their Bible courses. Better quality and greater quantity of courses in religion are needed to convince the colleges of the sincerity of the preparatory schools.
- (12) Colleges mentioned in the reports as accepting admission certificates for work done in Bible are being investigated to determine the number and proportion of students making application for admission in the fall of 1934.

Frank L. Boyden  
Claudine Clements  
Walter W. Haviland  
S. B. Knowlton  
Laura H. Wild  
Herbert L. Newman, Chairman

## EDITORIAL

### **The Annual Meeting**

On one of the cover pages will be found the announcement of our annual meeting. It is our twenty-fifth birthday. The program is varied and of great concern. These are good reasons for making an earnest effort to come and participate.

### **Bible Instruction in Secondary Schools**

This issue contains two important studies dealing with Bible instruction in secondary schools. No subject affects more vitally our mission.

What can be done to improve the situation? One thing that can and should be done is to push proper biblical instruction into the secondary schools.

### **Professor Leuba's Statistics on Religious Belief**

Professor Leuba published in a recent issue of *Harper's Magazine* the result of a questionnaire addressed to American scientists touching their belief in God and the future life. The tabulated result is that only 30% of American scientists still believe in God and the future life as the "Churches" teach these doctrines. On first thought, the conclusion is disconcerting; but upon reflection, it appears that the situation is far from being as serious as it appears; although it contains a challenge to those who like members of NABI have religious belief at heart.

The first consideration is that the proportion of believers is really large. Scripture and experience never place the number of believers high. "Many are called, but few are chosen." The majorities go along the way of least resistance: "Wide is the gate and broad is the way which leads to destruction, and those who enter thereby are many; for small

is the gate and narrow the way which leads to life, and those who find it are few." Primitive man found belief easy; with increase of intelligence, belief is more difficult; and few care to make the effort required. It is deep insight into human nature that illustrates the rarity of faith by such stories as that which tells that of the whole Wilderness generation only two men, Caleb and Joshua, had faith enough to enter the promised land; and that in the days of Noah, only one family of the whole human race had faith enough to survive.

Such is the tragedy of history. The Socrates, the Pauls, the Kants are few. You cannot determine truth by numbers; and fortunately truth persists in spite of minorities.

A second consideration is that Professor Leuba damaged his conclusion by a too narrow and antiquated definition of God; and that on broader lines, on his own admission, he could have increased the proportion of believers to a considerable extent. He assumes as a criterion the belief of the "Churches." But anyone acquainted with the make-up of our modern churches must know that they do not represent a uniformity of belief, but range from the extreme literalist to the most liberal.

The only conception of God that counts in the questionnaire is that which regards Him as "influenced," that is, diverted from His purpose, by prayer or praise. In other words, it is the naive notion which thinks of God as in a quandary when asked for a fine day by a washer woman and for rain by a farmer. But to propound such a question to scientists is no compliment on their intelligence. Millikan's conception of God, according to which science reveals a "universe that knows no caprice, a universe that can be counted upon,



in a word, a God who works through law," that conception is ruled out. That it might be possible to combine faith in God and Providence under uniform law with prayer, not the prayer that seeks to subvert the will of God, but to learn it, and submit to it, as was done by the greatest religious genius of the world in His prayer: "Father, all things are possible with Thee; if it be possible, let this cup pass from Me; yet not My will but Thy will be done"; that is not taken account of in the questionnaire. It is no wonder that many of those who received the questionnaire refused to reply to it.

The third consideration concerns the assumption that scientists as such are competent judges of religious issues. This involves the logical fallacy of irrelevancy. An Edison may be an expert in electricity, but that does not give him authority to pronounce on the subject of the future life. Ford, who said that history was bunk, may be an expert in automobiles, but that does not entitle him to be heard on history. It seems almost incredible to have to say such commonplaces to a scholar of the type of Professor Leuba. He would never think of seeking a worth-while opinion on the subject of psychology from a mere expert in botany. Yet he takes it for granted that scientists are competent judges of matters of religion.

Those of us who have spent more than half a life time in halls of learning and have had close contact with our colleagues in the faculty of science and the student body in general are by no means convinced of their acquaintance with matters religious. We have met among our science colleagues occasionally those who had some knowledge of current thought in philosophy and religion, but most of them, while distinguished in their particular branch of science, are but tyros in religious subjects.

With the student body it is far worse. The drift toward professionalism in our college curriculum leaves no room for culture courses,

much less for courses in philosophy, Bible and religion. In the university from which Prof. Allport drew his statistics of students' belief, which Prof. Leuba quotes, not 4% ever took a course in philosophy or Bible and religion; and those who took them were preparing for religious work, which very fact made them ineligible for inclusion in Prof. Leuba's statistics. Religion is an empirical or experimental science: it can and must be taught. Due to neglect of early and proper religious instruction, there exists among otherwise intelligent people an astounding ignorance of the simplest matters of religion. To find out what scientists and college students believe on these subjects may satisfy curiosity, but for real value as bearing upon the questions at issue, the questionnaire was a misdirected effort, and might just as well have been sent to the blacksmiths or goldsmiths of America. Its real value, not intended, consists in the revelation it makes that scientists and students are fit objects of missionary effort. Why should the philosophers, theologians, and biblical specialists not have been included? Are the incumbents of the chairs in theses subjects in the universities of America not scientists? Are the psychologists, physicists, biologists, sociologists the only unbiased pursuers of truth with proper scientific method? Prof. Leuba might have found in the list of the 450 members of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis which represents the biblical scholarship of America, those competent as no other scientific body to answer his questionnaire (more adequately formed) and as representative of the specialists of Cattell's list. Whatever the result, it would at least have been expert testimony.

We will not accuse Prof. Leuba of deliberate animosity to religion but only to superstition. But for the reasons stated his statistics are utterly misleading and valueless.

To members of NABI, however, it presents a challenge. We must, first, continue our efforts to free our conceptions of God and

immortality from crass features and present them in the form which they have taken in the light of the most scientific exegesis; and, secondly, we must spread our findings in larger

measure to dissipate the ignorance and misunderstandings that so evidently prevail even in intelligent circles.

*Ismar J. Peritz*

### Members of the Association\*

Prof. David E. Adams, B. D., Mount Holyoke College, So. Hadley, Mass.  
 Rev. H. W. C. Ainley, R. D., Rockport, Texas.  
 Prof. William F. Albright, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.  
 Prof. Herbert C. Alleman, D. D., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.  
 Prof. May A. Allen, Ph. D., Newcomb College, New Orleans, La.  
 Prof. Alfred E. Alton, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.  
 Prof. Mary E. Andrews, Ph. D. (Goucher College), 2320 N. Calvert St., Baltimore, Md.  
 Rev. J. S. Armentrout, 1125 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Prof. William Goodwin Aurelio (Boston University), 18 Medfield St., Boston, Mass.  
 Prof. Otto J. Baab, Ph. D., Garrett Biblical Inst., Northwestern University Campus, Evanston, Ill.  
 Prof. W. E. Bachman, D. D., 3120 Third St., Des Moines, Iowa.  
 Prof. Albert E. Barnett, B. D., Scarritt College for Christian Workers, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Prof. Salo W. Baron, Ph. D., Fayerweather Hall, Columbia Univ., New York City.  
 Prof. George A. Barton, Ph. D., 4243 Spruce St., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Prof. Henry L. Beam, A. M. (Heidelberg College), 231 E. Market St., Tiffin, Ohio.  
 Prof. Dwight M. Beck, Ph. D., Syracuse University, Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Prof. Irwin R. Beiler, Ph. D., Allegheny College, Meadville, Penn.  
 Prof. Marion J. Benedict, Ph. D., Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va.  
 Prof. John C. Bennett (Auburn Theol. Sem.), Morgan Hall, Auburn, N. Y.  
 Rev. C. Theodore Benze, D. D., 7304 Boyen St., Mount Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Prof. John Biegeleisen, M. A., Eden Theol. Sem., 119 Bompert Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.  
 Mrs. Nell W. Black (Iowa State Teachers College), 2404 College, Cedar Falls, Iowa.  
 Prof. Alexander M. Blackburn, Friends' Academy, Locust Valley, N. Y.  
 Prof. Charles M. Bond, Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa.  
 Prof. E. P. Booth, Ph. D. (Boston University School

of Religious Education), 20 Mount Vernon St., Boston, Mass.  
 Mr. Frank L. Boyden, Deerfield Academy, Deerfield, Mass.  
 Prof. Harvie Branscomb, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.  
 Prof. M. C. Bratcher, 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.  
 Prof. H. A. Brautigam, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.  
 Prof. Raymond R. Brewer, College of the Ozarks, Clarksville, Ark.  
 Prof. Edgar S. Brightman, Box 35, Newton Center, Mass.  
 Prof. D. J. Brimm (Presbyterian College), 120 S. Broad, Clinton, S. C.  
 Prof. Howard H. Brinton, Ph. D., Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pa.  
 Mrs. Beatrice Allard Brooks, Ph. D., Western College, Oxford, Ohio.  
 Prof. Raymond C. Brooks (Pomona College), 489 W. 6th St., Claremont, Calif.  
 Prof. L. H. Brumbaugh, Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.  
 Rev. Samuel Budde (St. Margaret's School), 2024 E. Main St., Waterbury, Conn.  
 Dr. Lucius H. Bugbee, M. A., 150 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.  
 Rev. William L. Burdick, Corresponding Secretary, Seventh Day Baptist Missionary Society, Ashaway, R. I.  
 Prof. Millar Burrows, Ph. D., 409 Prospect Ave., New Haven, Conn.  
 Prof. Henry J. Cadbury, Ph. D., 7 Buckingham Place, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Prof. Patrick H. Carmichael, Columbia Theol. Sem., Decatur, Ga.  
 Prof. L. L. Carpenter, Ph. D., Limestone College, Gaffney, S. C.  
 Prof. Adelaide Case, Ph. D., Teachers College, Columbia University, N. Y. C.  
 Prof. Robert Pierce Casey, Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.  
 Prof. Maynard L. Cassady, B. D. (Univ. of Rochester), 169 Avalon Drive, Rochester, N. Y.  
 Chaplain Roy B. Chamberlain, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.  
 Mr. Frank L. Chaney, B. A., 18 Lincoln Ave., Takoma Park, D. C.  
 Dean W. G. Chanter, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.

\* This list has been corrected to October 20, 1934. Members are requested to notify the Secretary-Treasurer, Carl E. Purinton, Adelphi College, Garden City, N. Y., of any corrections or changes of address.

- The Chaplain, St. Mark's School, Southborough, Mass.
- Prof. C. A. Choate, Williamsport Dickinson Sem., Williamsport, Pa.
- Prof. James T. Cleland (Amherst College), 16 Taylor St., Amherst, Mass.
- Prof. Frank W. Clelland, 3 Fielding Street, Concord, Mass.
- Miss Claudine E. Clements, Ph. D., National Cathedral School, Washington, D. C.
- Prof. Isaac S. Corn, Ph. D., 1308 Clinton Blvd., Bloomington, Ill.
- Miss Margaret B. Crook, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- Prof. William A. Crozier, B. D., Tusculum College, Greenville, Tenn.
- Prof. A. Bruce Curry, Ph. D., Union Theol. Sem., New York, N. Y.
- Prof. Muriel S. Curtis, B. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
- Prof. Gerald D. Cushing, Hebron Academy, Hebron, Maine.
- Miss M. E. J. Czarnomska, Cecil Apartments 403, 1026 15th St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. George Dahl, Ph. D., 91 Linden St., New Haven, Conn.
- Prof. Clara W. Davidson, Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, Va.
- Mrs. Josephine Rhoades Davis, Guilford College, N. C.
- Rev. Leon A. Davison, Blair Academy, Blairstown, N. J.
- Prof. John P. Deane, M. A., Beloit College, Beloit, Wis.
- Miss Mary DeBardeleben, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.
- Mrs. Dora K. Degen (Alfred University), 33 South Main St., Alfred, N. Y.
- Prof. Walter B. Denny, Ph. D., Russell Sage College, Troy, N. Y.
- Prof. J. R. Denyes, Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis.
- Prof. F. M. Derwacter, Ph. D. (William Jewell College), 202 W. Franklin St., Liberty, Mo.
- Prof. Jeanette DeYoung, Chatham Hall, Chatham, Va.
- Pres. Charles Edward Diehl, A. M., Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.
- Prof. Charles A. Dinsmore (Yale Divinity School), 10 Old Hartford Turnpike, New Haven, Conn.
- Mrs. Lawrence Doggett, Y M C A College, Springfield, Mass.
- Prof. W. N. Donovan, A. M. (Andover Newton Theol. Sem.), 117 Cypress St., Newton Center, Mass.
- Rev. Charles H. Dort, 477 Irving Ave., Brooklyn, N. Y.
- Dr. Clifford H. Drury, Ph. D., Box 347, Moscow, Idaho.
- Prof. George S. Duncan, Ph. D., 2900 7th St., N. E., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. M. H. Dunsmore, Ph. D., Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
- Prof. Louise S. Eby, Ph. D., Milwaukee-Downer College, Milwaukee, Wis.
- Rev. J. F. Eddins, B. D., Clinton, La.
- Dean Granville D. Edwards, Bible College of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
- Rabbi Louis I. Egelson, M. A., 895 Clinton Springs Ave., Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Rev. James W. Eichelberger, Jr., 460 East 40th St., Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Paul N. Elbin, Ph. D., West Liberty State Teachers College, West Liberty, W. Va.
- Rev. John W. Elliott, B. D. (American Baptist Publication Society), 1701 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Calvert N. Ellis (Juniata College), 1002 Mifflin St., Huntingdon, Pa.
- Prof. Morton S. Enslin (Crozer Theol. Sem.), 4 Seminary Ave., Chester, Pa.
- Dr. John T. Faris, 420 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Louisa N. Faucette, M. A., Lees McRae College, Banner Elk, N. C.
- Prof. David E. Faust, B. D., Catawba College, Salisbury, N. C.
- Prof. George H. Fickes, Ph. D., 726 Weygadt Drive, Easton, Pa.
- Prof. Floyd V. Filson, Th. D. (Presbyterian Theol. Sem.), 857 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. M. Hadwin Fischer, Ph. D., Lutheran Theol. Sem., Gettysburg, Pa.
- Prof. Florence Fitch, Ph. D. (Oberlin College), 97 Elm St., Oberlin, Ohio.
- Prof. John W. Flight, Ph. D., Haverford College, Haverford, Pa.
- Mrs. M. G. Folsom (Maine Central Inst.), Lock Box 236, Pittsfield, Maine.
- Prof. Kenneth J. Foreman (Davidson College), 321 Willow St., New Haven, Conn.
- Prof. W. M. Forrest, University of Virginia, University, Va.
- Prof. Hazel E. Foster (Presbyterian College of Christian Education), 815 Belden Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Rev. William Mefford Fouts, A. B. (Northern Baptist Theol. Sem.), 3040 West Washington Blvd., Station D., Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Henry T. Fowler, Ph. D., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Prin. Laura Fowler, A. B., Hannah More Academy, Reisterstown, Md.
- Mrs. Richard Huntington Franchot, 946 Cherry St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
- Prof. William Webb Freeman, 1318 Chestnut St., Commerce, Texas.
- Prof. Robert R. Fritsch, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.



- Prof. Samuel Garvin, M. A., University of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa.
- Dr. Herbert W. Gates, B. D. (General Secretary, Congregational Education Society), 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
- Germantown Academy, School Lane & Greene St., Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. F. W. Gingrich, Albright College, Reading, Pa.
- Miss Beatrice L. Goff, 69 Stratford Road, Melrose, Mass.
- Prof. Reuben A. Goodman (Newberry College), 2102 College St., Newberry, S. C.
- Prof. Frederic S. Goodrich, A. M. (Albion College) 302 College, Albion, Mich.
- Rev. Warner F. Gookin, Avon Old Farms, Avon, Conn.
- Miss Mary E. Gordon, M. A., 22 W. Erie St., Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. William Creighton Graham, Ph. D., 216 Oriental Institute, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Elihu Grant, Apt. 143, 242 East 19th St., New York City.
- Prof. Charles J. Greene, D. D. (Hendrix College), 1221 Clifton St., Conway, Ark.
- Dr. Homer L. Grice, 161-8th Avenue North, Nashville, Tenn.
- Prof. Ross J. Griffith, B. D., Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
- Prof. Ivan G. Grimshaw, Ph. D., College of Emporia, Emporia, Kan.
- Prof. R. M. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, School Lane & Fox St., Pinehurst, Germantown, Pa.
- Prof. Eric G. Haden, B. D., Southwestern, Memphis, Tenn.
- Rev. Frank H. Hallock, S. T. D., Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.
- Miss Hall's School, Pittsfield, Mass.
- Prof. W. M. Hall, Ph. D., Franklin & Marshall Academy, Lancaster, Pa.
- Mrs. J. C. Hanley, A. M., Sayre College, Lexington, Ky.
- Prof. Georgia Harkness, Ph. D. (Elmira College), 313 W. 6th St., Elmira, N. Y.
- Prof. S. Ralph Harlow, Ph. D. (Smith College), 307 Prospect Hts., Northampton, Mass.
- Prof. Joseph G. Haroutunian (Wellesley College), 12 Cottage St., Wellesley, Mass.
- Prof. Raymond S. Hauptert (Moravian College & Theol. Sem.), 1310 Main St., Bethlehem, Pa.
- Prin. Walter W. Haviland (Friends' Select School), Parkway & 17th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Charles A. Hawley, Ph. D., Univer. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Pres. E. J. Heath, D. D., Moravian College for Women, Bethlehem, Pa.
- Prof. George P. Hedley, B. D. (Pacific School of Religion), 1798 Scenic Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
- Prof. Charles B. Hedrick, D. D., Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.
- Prof. Martin Hegland, Ph. D. (Olaf College), 1114 St. Olaf Ave., Northfield, Minn.
- Prof. MacKinley Helm, S. T. M. (Harvard University), 58 Monmouth St., Brookline, Mass.
- Prof. Carl V. Herron, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.
- Prof. H. I. Hester, A. B., William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo.
- Pres. Ralph K. Hickok, D. D., Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio.
- Prof. John Harden Hicks, Southern Methodist Univ., Dallas, Texas.
- Prof. William Norwood Hicks, M. S. (Univ. of N. C.), 125 Chamberlain St., State College Station, Raleigh, N. C.
- Miss Ethelyn P. Hill, A. B., Baxter Seminary, Baxter, Tenn.
- Prof. W. Hobart Hill, M. A., Oklahoma City Univ., Oklahoma City, Okla.
- Prof. John G. Hill (Univ. of So. Calif.), 3551 University Ave., Los Angeles, Calif.
- Rev. Norman A. Holmes (Straight College), 2307 Bienville Ave., New Orleans, La.
- Prof. Horace T. Houf (Ohio Univ.), 165 N. Lancaster St., Athens, Ohio.
- Dean Lynn Harold Hough, Drew University, Madison, N. J.
- Prof. J. P. Howe, Ph. D., Bonebrake Theol. Sem., Dayton, Ohio.
- Prof. John H. Howson, Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Prof. Mary I. Hussey, Ph. D., Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Prof. L. W. Irwin, College of William & Mary, Williamsburg, Va.
- Prof. Arthur J. Jackson (The American University), 407-4115 Wisconsin Ave., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. Fleming James, Ph. D. (Berkeley Divinity School), 4 Mansfield St., New Haven, Conn.
- Mr. Alan Jenkins, Asheville School, Asheville, N. C.
- Rev. P. J. Jensen (McDonogh School), St. Thomas Lane, Owings Mills, Md.
- Rev. J. E. Johnson, B. D. (Univ. of Fla.), 1215 West Masonic Street, Gainesville, Fla.
- Prof. Leonard Z. Johnson, B. D. (Howard Univ.), 1236 Harvard St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Miss Alice W. Jones, Oak Grove Seminary, Vassalboro, Me.
- Prof. E. E. Jones, Northfield Seminary, East Northfield, Mass.
- Prof. Leo Jung, Ph. D. (Yeshiva College), 131 W. 86th St., New York City.
- Prof. Moses Jung, Ph. D., State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia.
- Miss Eliza Kellas, Emma Willard School, Troy, N. Y.



Prof. Edwin H. Kellogg, Ph. D., Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N. Y.  
 Prof. Eliza H. Kendrick, Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.  
 Mrs. Charles Foster Kent, 625 Orange St., New Haven, Conn.  
 Rev. Frank M. Kerr (Christ's First Presbyterian Church), Fulton Ave., Hempstead, N. Y.  
 Dean Frederick D. Kershner, A. M. (Butler Univ.), 4257 Clarendon Rd., Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Mr. Lloyd R. Killam, M. A., University of Hawaii, University Ave., Honolulu, Hawaii.  
 Prof. Albion Roy King, Ph. D., Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.  
 Prof. Willis J. King, Gammon Theol. Seminary, Atlanta, Ga.  
 Prof. Carl Sumner Knopf, Ph. D. (Univ. of Southern Calif.), 3551 University Park, Los Angeles, Calif.  
 Chaplain R. C. Knox, Columbia University, New York, N. Y.  
 Prof. Mary E. Lakenan, M. A., Mary Baldwin College, Staunton, Va.  
 Prof. Elbert C. Lane, D. D. (Hartford Theol. Sem.), 69 Tremont St., Hartford, Conn.  
 Prof. George Lang, B. D., University of Alabama, University, Ala.  
 Prof. J. H. Langenwalter, B. D., Friends University, Wichita, Kan.  
 Dean Frank Glenn Lankard, Ph. D., Brothers College, Drew Univ., Madison, N. J.  
 Prof. Paul F. Laubenstein, S. T. M. (Connecticut College), 722 William St., New London, Conn.  
 Bishop Frederick D. Leete, D. D., 720 Omaha National Bank Bldg., Omaha, Neb.  
 Prof. H. F. Legg, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.  
 Prof. H. G. Leist, Iowa Wesleyan College, Mt. Pleasant, Ia.  
 Rev. William P. Lemon, D. D., 26 E. Market St., Iowa City, Iowa.  
 Miss Alice L. Lennon, B. L., Rabun Gap-Nacoochee School, Rabun Gap, Ga.  
 Mr. S. B. Linhart, 100 State Hall, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.  
 Dean Lawrence Little, A. M., Western Maryland College, Westminster, Md.  
 Rev. S. Burman Long, 608 Willis Ave., Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Prof. Lindsay B. Longacre, Ph. D. (Iliff School of Theology), 22 So. Fillmore St., Denver, Col.  
 Prof. F. C. Longaker, A. M., P. O. Box 429, Salem, Va.  
 Pres. A. E. Look, Ph. D. (Ellis College), Newton Square, Pa.  
 Prof. L. R. Loomis, Keuka College, Keuka Park, N. Y.  
 Rev. Julian Price Love (Presbyterian Theol. Sem.), 2119 Napoleon Blvd., Louisville, Ky.

Chaplain Sidney Lovett (Yale University), 220 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.  
 Mrs. Mary Ely Lyman (Union Theol. Sem. & Barnard College), 606 West 122nd St., New York City.  
 Dr. J. P. McCallie, Ph. D., The McCallie School, Missionary Ridge, Chattanooga, Tenn.  
 Dr. Selby Vernon McCasland, Goucher College, Baltimore, Md.  
 Prof. Lee S. McCollester, 48 Professors Row, Tufts College, Mass.  
 Miss Goldie McCue (Ohio Wesleyan University), Austin Hall, Delaware, Ohio.  
 Prof. Walter R. Marsh, St. Paul's School, Garden City, N. Y.  
 Miss Martha Martin (Elizabethtown College), 68 E. Washington St., Elizabethtown, Pa.  
 Prof. W. W. Martin, 1810 East Belmont Circle, Nashville, Tenn.  
 Prof. Henry H. Meeter, Calvin College, Grand Rapids, Mich.  
 Prof. Bernard E. Meland, Ph. D. (Central College), 605 N. Church St., Fayette, Mo.  
 Prof. Ross Miller, Ph. D., Wittenberg College, Springfield, Ohio.  
 Prof. R. H. Miller (Manchester College), 703 College Ave., North Manchester, Ind.  
 Mr. S. J. Mills, The Haverford School, Haverford, Pa.  
 Rev. Henry Moehling, Jr., 1452 No. 59th St., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Rev. Gardner Monks, Lenox School, Lenox, Mass.  
 Prof. Kenneth M. Monroe, Th. D., Ashland College, Ashland, Ohio.  
 Prof. Dale Hendry Moore, B. D., Lafayette College, Easton, Pa.  
 Prof. Lloyd Morris, B. D., Coe College, 124 Center Point Rd., Cedar Rapids, Iowa.  
 Prof. Elmer W. K. Mould, Ph. D. (Elmira College), 503 Fitch St., Elmira, N. Y.  
 Dean James Muilenburg, Ph. D., The University of Maine, Orono, Maine.  
 Prof. H. E. Myers, S. T. M., Duke University, Durham, N. C.  
 Prof. Toyozo W. Nakarai, Ph. D. Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.  
 Prof. Charles F. Nesbitt, Millsaps College, Jackson, Miss.  
 Prof. R. Neumann, D. Litt., Carthage College, Carthage, Ill.  
 Prof. Warren N. Nevius, D. D., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa.  
 Prof. H. L. Newman, Colby College, Waterville, Me.  
 Miss Helen R. H. Nichol, The Master's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.  
 Mr. George Nicholson, Headmaster, Kingswood School, West Hartford, Conn.  
 Prof. O. M. Norlie, Ph. D., Luther College, Decorah, Iowa.

- Prof. John B. Noss (Franklin & Marshall College), 520 W. James St., Lancaster, Pa.
- Mr. Robert E. Owen, Oak Grove Seminary, Vassalboro, Maine.
- Miss Ellen S. Ogden, Seabury House, Milford, Mass.
- Prof. John Orr, Ph. D. (Westminster College), 533 S. Market St., New Wilmington, Pa.
- Prof. Wilfred T. Packer, B. D., Rio Grande College, Rio Grande, Ohio.
- Mrs. Lewis Bayles Paton, 44 Kirkland St., Cambridge, Mass.
- Prof. Charles H. Patterson, Ph. D., University of Nebraska, Lincoln, Neb.
- Rev. Endicott Peabody, LL.D., Groton School, Groton, Mass.
- Mrs. Lydia C. Perin, % Cincinnati Training School, Bethesda Hospital, Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Prof. Ismar J. Peritz, Ph. D., Litt. D., S. T. D., Lake Bluff, Wolcott, N. Y.
- Rev. Prof. E. Guthrie Perry, Ph. D., 437 Asseneboine Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Can.
- Mr. H. A. Peters (University School), N. E. Cor. Claythorne and Brantley Roads, Cleveland, Ohio.
- Rev. Ellis E. Pierce, Th. D., R. F. D. 1, Auburn, N. Y.
- Dean William H. Powers, Hendricks Chapel (Syracuse University), Syracuse, N. Y.
- Prof. Alexander C. Purdy, Ph. D. (Hartford Theological Seminary), 96 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn.
- Prof. Carl E. Purinton, Ph. D., Adelphi College, Garden City, N. Y.
- Prof. William E. Purvis (Grove City College), Ketter Dormitory, Grove City, Pa.
- Prof. Charles Lynn Pyatt, The College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
- Prof. Chester Warren Quimby (Dickinson College), 214 South West St., Carlisle, Pa.
- Mr. William J. Reagan, Principal, Oakwood School, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
- Miss A. Kathryn Rogers (Northfield Seminary), Marquand Hall, East Northfield, Mass.
- Pres. Harry Lathrop Reed, D. D. (Auburn Theological Seminary), Seminary Campus, Auburn, N. Y.
- Prof. Vernon Rice, M. A., Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Prof. Katharine L. Richards, Smith College, Northampton, Mass.
- Prof. M. E. Ritzman, Ph. D. (Evangelical School of Theology), 1308 North 13th St., Reading, Pa.
- Miss Narola E. Rivenburg, Ph. D. (The Baptist Inst. for Christian Workers), 1421-29 Snyder Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Corwin C. Roach, Bexley Hall of Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio.
- Rev. G. E. Robbins (Vt. Council of Rel. Ed.), 455 Shelburne Rd., Burlington, Vt.
- Prof. Henry Barton Robison, Culver-Stockton College, Canton, Mo.
- Miss Puera B. Robison, B. D., M. A., The Knox School, Cooperstown, N. Y.
- Prof. W. Gordon Ross, B. D., Berea College, Berea College Station, Ky.
- Dean Elbert Russell, Ph. D., Duke University, Durham, N. C.
- Prof. J. P. Rutledge, 2408 East Ave., Austin, Texas.
- Prof. C. T. Ryan, A. M., Ed. M. (Kearney State Teachers College), Box 423, Kearney, Neb.
- Mr. William L. Savage (Chas. Scribner's Sons), 597 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.
- Mr. Charles W. Scheid, B. D., Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.
- Prof. L. B. Schenck, Davidson College, Davidson, N. C.
- Prof. Frederick A. Schilling, Ph. D., Walla Walla College, College Place, Wash.
- Prof. F. W. Schneider, Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa.
- Pres. A. T. Schulmair, Genesee Wesleyan Seminary, Lima, N. Y.
- Prof. M. H. Schuster, M. A., 4722 Hillside Ave., Lincoln, Neb.
- Prof. Paul J. Schwab, Ph. D. (Trinity University), 219 E. University Ave., Waxahachie, Texas.
- Prof. E. F. Scott (Union Seminary), Broadway at 120th St., New York City.
- Prof. Frank D. Scott, D. D., 218 Jenkintown, Pa.
- Prof. Stanley Scott, Viking, Alberta, Canada.
- Prof. William Scott, Th. D., Randolph Macon College, Lynchburg, Va.
- Rev. Delton L. Scudder (Wesleyan University), Durham, Conn.
- Prof. Ovid R. Sellers, Ph. D. (Presbyterian Theol. Sem.), 846 Chalmers Place, Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Cecil J. Semans, B. D., Dakota Wesleyan Univ., Mitchell, S. D.
- Prof. A. H. Seymour, M. A., C-815, Aberdeen, S. D.
- Prof. Edwin Shaw, Milton College, Milton, Wis.
- Miss Cecilia May Sheppard, East 15th St. & Denver Ave., Kansas City, Mo.
- Prof. R. J. Shortlidge, The Tome School, Port Deposit, Md.
- Prof. A. Lincoln Shute, Th. D., Taylor University, Upland, Ind.
- Prin. Thomas W. Sidwell (Sidwells' Friends School), 1811 Eye St., N. W., Washington, D. C.
- Prof. Edward Paul Simms, Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va.
- Prof. Charles F. Sitterly, Drew University, Madison, N. J.
- Dean Seth W. Slaughter, B. D. (Bible College), 1300 Oread, Lawrence, Kan.
- Prof. J. Paul Slaybaugh, West Nottingham Academy, Colara, Md.
- Miss Frances W. Smith, 1221 Farwell Ave., Chicago, Ill.
- Prof. Louise Pettibone Smith, Ph. D., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.

- Prof. Robert Seneca Smith, Ph.D. (Yale Divinity School), 64 Swarthmore St., New Haven, Conn.
- Rev. Wilbur M. Smith, D. D. (The Presbyterian Church of Coatesville), 359 E. Lincoln Highway, Coatesville, Pa.
- Prof. C. W. Sommerville, Ph.D. (Queens-Chicora College), 227 E. Park Ave., Charlotte, N. C.
- Dean A. I. Spanton, M. A., University of Akron, Akron, Ohio.
- Prof. Earl E. Speicher, Ph.D., Northland College, Ashland, Wis.
- Prof. Charles D. Spotts (Franklin & Marshall College), 834 Buchanan Ave., Lancaster, Pa.
- Rev. L. L. Sprague, D. D., President, Wyoming Seminary, Kingston, Pa.
- Dean James S. Stevens, University of Maine, Orono, Maine.
- Prof. H. B. Stewart, Auburn Theol. Sem., Auburn, N. Y.
- Prof. Russell W. Stine, Muhlenberg College, Allentown, Pa.
- Prof. Mortimer M. Stocker (Albany College), Albany, Oregon.
- Rev. John W. Stockwell, Ph.D., 2129 Chestnut St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Miss Maude L. Strayer, Master's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
- Prof. G. V. Stryker, The American International College, Springfield, Mass.
- Prof. S. W. Sturgis, Groton School, Groton, Mass.
- Dr. R. W. Swetland, The Peddie School, Hightstown, N. J.
- Prof. Alma Willis Sydenstricker, Agnes Scott College, Decatur, Ga.
- Prof. George S. Tarry, Randolph-Macon College, Ashland, Va.
- Rev. Ronalds Taylor (Univ. of Maryland), Box 61, College Park, Md.
- Prof. James W. Tenner, B. D., Park College, Parkville, Mo.
- Prof. Daniel W. Terry, Cazenovia Seminary, Cazenovia, N. Y.
- Mr. L. Ralston Thomas (Moses Brown School), 257 Hope St., Providence, R. I.
- Prof. J. B. Tidwell, 1309 South 8th Street, Waco, Texas.
- Prof. Godfrey Tietze, B. D., University of Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tenn.
- Miss Rachel Timberlake, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas.
- Prof. A. B. Trowbridge, Rollins College, Winter Park, Fla.
- Prof. Russell C. Tuck, S. T. M. (Andover Theol. Sem.), 154 Institution Ave., Newton Centre, Mass.
- Prof. Dudley Tyng, Brown University, Providence, R. I.
- Prof. Guy Linwood Vannah (N. E. School of Theology), 17 Rockville Park, Roxbury, Mass.
- Prof. George Handy Wailes (Temple Univ.), 517 S. 48th St., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Henry H. Walker, Ph.D., Talladega College, Talladega, Ala.
- Prof. R. H. Walker, 173 Sandusky St., Delaware, Ohio.
- Prof. Sigismund C. Walker (New Orleans Univ.), 5524 Perrier St., New Orleans, La.
- Prof. James Wallace (Macalaster College), 112 Cambridge Ave., St. Paul, Minn.
- Prin. George A. Walton, George School, George School, Pa.
- Miss Jean Wardrope, St. Anne's School for Girls, Charlottesville, Va.
- Mr. Henry T. Ware, General Secretary Christian Association, State Teachers College, Hattiesburg, Miss.
- Prof. O. W. Warmingham, 20 Mt. Vernon St., Boston, Mass.
- Prof. L. Waterman, Ph.D., University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Prof. William A. Weber, Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
- Prof. J. M. Wells, B. D., Hillsdale College, Hillsdale, Mich.
- Dr. Sidney A. Weston, Ph.D. (Editor, Congregational Publishing Society), 14 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.
- Westtown School (% Periodical Club), Westtown, Pa.
- Prof. Lester P. White, Mount Hermon School, Mount Hermon, Mass.
- Prof. S. E. Wicker, S. T. D. (Holy Trinity Lutheran Church), 2609 Madison St., Wilmington, Del.
- Pres. J. M. Wilbur, D. D. (Baptist Inst. for Christian Workers), 1425 Snyder Ave., Philadelphia, Pa.
- Prof. Laura H. Wild, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Prof. Amos N. Wilder, Ph.D. (Andover Newton Theol. Sem.), 154 Institution Ave., Newton Centre, Mass.
- Prof. C. E. Wildman, 36 Hurd Road, Belmont, Mass.
- Miss Edna B. Willey (Lincoln School), 301 Butler Ave., Providence, R. I.
- Prof. Arthur Williams (Florida State College for Women), 524 West College Ave., Tallahassee, Fla.
- Miss Mira B. Wilson, Principal, Northfield Seminary, East Northfield, Mass.
- Prof. D. Helen Wolcott, Mount Holyoke College, South Hadley, Mass.
- Prof. W. H. Wood, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H.
- Prof. Edward S. Worcester, B. D. (New Brunswick Theol. Sem.), 3 Seminary Place, New Brunswick, N. J.
- Prof. William F. Wunsch, A. B. (New-Church Theol. School), 57 Avon Hill St., Cambridge, Mass.

Wyoming Seminary, (% L. L. Sprague, President), Kingston, Pa.  
 Rev. Edgar C. Young, S. T. M. (Vicar, Phillips Brooks Memorial Chapel), 5817 Filbert St., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Mr. William Lindsay Young (Secretary Board of Christian Education), 1131 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia, Pa.  
 Prof. Rayborn L. Zerby Bates College, Lewiston, Maine.

### Libraries

Ambrose Swasey Library (Colgate-Rochester Divinity School), 1100 South Goodman St., Rochester, N. Y.  
 American School of Oriental Research, Jerusalem, Palestine.  
 Andover-Harvard Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass.  
 Auburn Theological Seminary Library, Seminary Campus, Auburn, N. Y.  
 Bucknell Library (Crozer Theol. Sem.), Chester, Pa.  
 Drew University Library, Madison, N. J.  
 Eden Theol. Sem. Library, 475 East Lockwood Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.  
 Episcopal Theol. School Library, 99 Brattle St., Cambridge, Mass.

Flora Stone Mather College Library, 11130 Bellflower Rd., Cleveland, Ohio.  
 General Theol. Sem. Library, Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y.  
 Librarian of Congress, Washington, D. C.  
 Suomi College Theological Library, Hancock, Mich.  
 Louisville Presbyterian Sem. Library, 109 East Broadway, Louisville, Ky.  
 Meredith College Library, Raleigh, N. C.  
 New-Church Theological School, 48 Quincy St., Cambridge, Mass.  
 Northern Baptist Theol. Sem. Library, 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Station D., Chicago, Ill.  
 Oberlin College Library, Oberlin, Ohio.  
 Princeton Theol. Sem. Library, Princeton, N. J.  
 School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.  
 Southern Baptist Theol. Sem. Library, 2825 Lexington Rd., Louisville, Ky.  
 Suomi College Theological Seminary Library, Hancock, Mich.  
 Syracuse University Library, Syracuse, N. Y.  
 Union College of British Columbia, Vancouver, B. C.  
 Union Theol. Sem. Library, Broadway at 120th St., New York City.  
 Vassar College Library, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
 Wittenberg College Library, Springfield, Ohio.  
 Yale Divinity School Library, New Haven, Conn.  
 Zion Research Library, Box 624, Brookline Village, Mass.

## BOOK REVIEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

SEMITIC AND HAMITIC ORIGINS  
 Social and Religious. *George Aaron Barton*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1934. XVI-395 pp. \$4.00.

ARABIA AND THE BIBLE. *James A. Montgomery*. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1934. X-207 pp. \$2.00.

It is the Bible that contains the first treatise on the subject of Prof. Barton's book. What he has done elucidates the biblical material in Genesis and Exodus with the light of all the branches of biblical science, particularly archaeology. He discusses the cradle lands of the Semitic and Hamitic races, their languages and neighbors, their intermixtures and composition. He deals with the early social life of the Semites and Hamites, the family, marriage, and curious customs related to them.

He deals most fully with the origin of religion in general and particularly with the religions of Egypt, Babylonia, and Arabia; and most particularly with the religion of the Hebrews, its origin and the contribution of Moses.

We are accustomed to expect the very best from Prof. Barton, and there is no disappointment. During the forty years since his Harvard doctorate in Semitics, he has made original contributions to various phases of Semitic and biblical subjects. They have prepared him for his latest undertaking, and the volume bears eloquent testimony to his high ideals in the search after the facts. It is a re-statement, after thirty years, of a pioneer discussion of the same subject in the light of



fresh discoveries. The treatment is characterized by openness, logical argumentation, and fairness to those with whom he differs. It is transparently clear and written with a warmth as if what is said really matters.

It is refreshing to find a strictly critical and scientific scholar positive and constructive. This shows itself particularly in the treatment of Moses. Prof. Barton avoids the extremes of both the traditionalist, who take all the biblical data equally authentic, and the hypercritical, who find nothing authentic. With critical discrimination, the author defends the historical character of Moses as the founder of the Hebrew religion. He adopts what the reviewer suggested twenty years ago, a psychological interpretation of the story of the "burning bush," and traces the conversion of Moses back to his Kenite-Midianite environment.

It is a fit climax to a great book when the author sketches Hebrew religion after Moses, and in the "Epilogue" reveals his faith in the religion of the Bible, and defends it as a divine revelation in the human soul against modern attempts to subvert it.

Prof. Montgomery's book deals with one phase of the general subject treated by Prof. Barton, namely, Arabia. It elucidates every scriptural reference to Arabia with the light from the most recent literature. It is a highly creditable piece of work; and deserves to stand by the side of Prof. Barton's as the authors themselves have stood side by side for the highest ideals of biblical scholarship.

The author's thesis is that Israel is more indebted to Arabia than to any other of its surrounding countries; and that throughout all its history, and way into New Testament times, that influence made itself felt. But that influence is considered broadly cultural; and the geographical, economic, and historical elements appear foremost. The chief value of the book lies in the contribution it makes to our general knowledge of Arabia as a coun-

try with its peculiar climate, scenery, and civilization. A book of this kind was a desideratum; and there is none other to take its place.

But from the point of view of religion and particularly the religion of the Bible it is disappointing. The references to this element are few and only of a cursory character. Even in the section entitled "Hebrew and Arabian Religion," occupying only three pages, more is said of Islam than of the religion of the Bible. And yet it has become increasingly evident that in its essential elements Hebrew religion was born in the Arabian Desert, that it retained through its history the desert type, and that consequently it was the greatest contribution that Arabia has made to civilization.

The book that produced the epoch of what might be called the return of Moses, after he had been bowed out of history by extremists like Stade, was Hugo Gressmann's "Mose und seine Zeit," published, I think, 1913, a thoroughly critical work. When the reviewer prepared his "Old Testament History," published in 1915, it influenced him to the extent that he summarized Moses' influence upon subsequent history as follows: I. The political ideal of Mosaic times is that of a *theocracy* . . . the ruler is "called of God," that is, not hereditarily, but providentially raised by his fitness to meet the exigencies of his time, and amenable to popular approval . . . The body politic is free and independent, without class distinctions; and alert to assert its right: it is the desert type of government, free and easy as desert life . . . 2. The social ideal was that of the *simple life*, imposed by the unsettled mode of living in desert regions; its hardships and dangers left it free from luxury and effeminacy, drunkenness and debauch. 3. The religious conception of Mosaic times may be termed an *ethical henotheism*, that is, the recognition of only *one* God for Israel, or *monolatry*, the worship of only one God. This is the intermediate stage of development be-

tween polytheism and monotheism. All the religious sentiments and cultic acts are concentrated on Jehovah. There is only one sanctuary, and the cult is centralized. Only a comparison with the religions of surrounding peoples can make clear how notable this faith is. There is no image of Jehovah; no sacred prostitution, which Baal worship had; there is an absence of the rank spiritism, animism, and magic, so prominent in the cults which later influenced the Israelites; and in religious leadership the prophetic element, or the moral and spiritual, dominates over the priestly or ritual.

In these characteristics of the political, social, and religious ideas of the time of Moses can be recognized many of the ideals of the prophets of whom Moses was thus incipiently the forerunner: and which will still justify the order "Moses and the prophets."

This critical view, as clearly distinguished from the traditional as from the radical, is gradually gaining ascendancy. A contribution to the appreciation of this desert element in Hebrew history was made by Prof. John W. Flight, "The Nomadic Idea and Ideal in the Old Testament," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1923. Prof. C. C. McCown gave it treatment in an article in the *Journal of Geography*, 1924, "The Wilderness of Judea and the Nomadic Ideal. A Study in the Social and Religious Effects of Geographic Environment"; and he makes much of it in his book "The Genesis of the Social Gospel," 1929. And now Prof. Barton substantially accepts it. All this is strictly relevant to Prof. Montgomery's book under review.

If space permitted, the reviewer would be inclined to show in detail how Prof. Montgomery's recognition of the hoary age of Arabia's civilization justifies the view, defended in his "Old Testament History," that Israel's long residence at Kadesh represented no longer a nomadic but a semi-agricultural civilization, what Gressmann designates as the *ma-ase* type, the intermediate step between

*bedouin* and *fellahin*, which permits the placing of the origin not only of the decalogue but also substantial elements of the legislation of the so-called Book of Covenant into the desert period.

But, be this as it may, all biblical teachers are greatly indebted to Professors Montgomery and Barton not only for making most valuable contributions to the understanding of the Bible, but also for furnishing stimuli for further research.

Syracuse University

Ismar J. Peritz

### THREE SIGNIFICANT BOOKS ON PAUL

#### PAUL, HIS HERITAGE AND LEGACY.

By Kirsopp Lake. New York: Oxford University Press. 1934. (The Mary Flexner Lectures on the Humanities, Bryn Mawr College, 1932). Pp. 153. \$2.00.

#### THE ETHICAL TEACHING OF PAUL.

A Study in Origin. By Mary E. Andrews. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press. 1934. Pp. 185. \$2.00.

#### BEYOND DAMASCUS. A Biography of

Paul the Tarsian. By F. A. Spencer. New York. Harper's. 1934. Pp. 466. \$3.00.

Three books in this field could hardly be more varied in approach and content. All are intensely interesting and provocative, and are of great importance for teachers of New Testament.

Professor Lake's volume, as the title indicates, deals with Paul's setting in history and in thought. It is a book both valuable and delightful to read. Dividing naturally into three parts, the first treats of the Apostle's heritage from Israel and Judaism, Jesus, the Apostles, the Gentile world; the second of Paul's experience and its expression in relation to the Jews, and his conceptions of regeneration, inspiration and mysticism; the third of the "legacy" of some of the theological, psychological and ethical problems left by the work and influence of Paul.

Students of Paul will be grateful for the

clear light which Professor Lake throws upon those few sections of the "bridge between Jewish and Gentile Christianity" which can really be discerned by the historian, but which remains so bafflingly obscure over much of its length. A few remnants show at the Jewish end; a broken pier, the work of a mysterious John, rises between this and the hither end, Catholic Christianity. Paul's contributions to the building of this bridge are dealt with in this volume.

The discussion is concerned with the ethical rather than the theological content of the Pauline Gospel, and the treatment is made the more vital because it relates the discussion to modern problems of conduct and motive (a field in which Professor Lake is as much at home as in the historical period which is his specialty) rather than confining itself exclusively to Pauline ethics *per se*. There is a wholesome caution regarding the limitations of a study of early Christianity's problems and their solutions when these are used, as they are too often used, in attempts to solve the problems of a later day. "Early Christianity . . . presented solutions for the problems of its own day, and by so doing set new problems for the future to face." Timely and arresting also is the counsel to teachers, dropped in two asides: "The business of the teacher is to make men see a vision of life as they can never live it, and of a world which they can never inherit, so that they will struggle to make that which they pass on to their children approach a little more closely to the vision which they have seen." "The failure of much modern education is due to a tendency on the part of teachers to believe that the main business of education is to make their pupils possess more information than they would otherwise, whereas its real function is to make them think, and especially to make them become conscious of the many things which we do not know."

\* \* \* \* \*

Taking her cue for method from *Formge-*

*schichte* and from the social-historical procedure exemplified by such writers as Dean Case of Chicago, Professor Andrews approaches Paul and his teachings by way of his social experience. We have here, accordingly, an analysis of "the critical situations which Paul met, with a view to determining his sanctions for conduct, his modes of meeting human problems, his own behavior and his defense of that behavior where need for defense arose." "The theologians have dwelt upon his *ideas*; the present study would analyze his *behavior* in the effort to find his practical bases for the achievement of the good life in the varied human relationships of his experience."

Five chapters comprise the volume, the first three constituting a fine demonstration of the method pursued and its possibilities when applied to research on Pauline ethics. These deal with: An Ethical Problem: Must Gentiles Become Jews to be Christians?—The Personal Equation in Corinth?—Community Problems in Corinth.—

Then follow two chapters on "Was Paul an Intellectual?" and "Paul the Jew," which move in the realm where controversy is still rife and where neither side has as yet said the last word. Professor Andrews handles her material well, making due allowance for contrary evidence and opinion, yet contending strongly and cogently for the conclusions to which her evidence appears to lead.

Was Paul an Intellectual? (Possibly the word is not quite well chosen, but used in the special sense which it takes in this discussion its meaning is clear. So also for the words "spiritism" and "spiritistic," denoting religious or supernatural motivation and not referring to their usual application to "cult of the dead.") The answer is, no, he was not, and for several reasons some of which are: his predominant concern was with practical problems; his appeal was to experience and not to that type of theoretical and speculative reasoning called intellectual; his approach to life and its problems is not like that of Roman



Stoicism (under which, for practical purposes, first-century intellectualism may be subsumed); only the paraenetic (non-primary, ethical-precept) sections of his letters show resemblance to the non-speculative, popular (diatribe) type of first-century philosophical propaganda; his method of presenting the Christian message, and even his terminology often, are allied to the gnostic and mystery-cult presentations, and neither of these can be called intellectual movements. It is here, probably, that many readers will differ with the author most strongly. For though the profundity of Paul's "intellectual formulations" and his "attempts to defend and justify . . . his judgments" may have been exaggerated in the past, yet there seems still to remain enough evidence for Paul's mental acumen in wrestling with problems of faith as well as conduct, to justify the persistent view of Paul as an important early Christian theologian, even while it is admitted that much of his specific theology belongs to the first century. Possibly an over-emphasis on the practical is what tends to discount this.

Discussing the bearing of Paul's Judaism upon his ethics, Professor Andrews commits herself definitely to the view that "Paul's ethics is (not) sufficiently and satisfactorily explained out of Judaism alone." While allowing that the influence of Paul's Jewish heritage was not slight in this area, she contends that his "ethical judgments were much more conditioned by the contemporary social situation than . . . by any heritage from his past."

The book merits careful reading as a significant contribution to the inductive study of Pauline ethics.

\* \* \* \* \*

In "Beyond Damascus" by Professor F. A. Spencer, we have a vivid reconstruction of the first-century world, with greater emphasis upon the classical background than has been usual in studies of Paul's world. The author is a consummately skillful artist and has pro-

duced a work of lively historical imagination, fascinatingly written, but with the defects inherent in any attempt to paint the picture of a man and his work against a "full background." Indeed the background is a bit too full at many points, not only bringing in materials which lie quite outside Paul's span, but actually tending to usurp the place of Paul in the story. The historical details of the picture need occasionally to be corrected by a check-up of the provenience of many composite elements which are often woven together with little reference to their exact chronological locus. For example, in writing of the mystery-religions and their possible influence on Paul, the author rather recklessly constructs a sort of "sample" mystery-cult out of documentary constituents which hail from anywhere within two or three centuries of Paul. It is only fair to say that the author acknowledges in his introduction that he is "not unaware" of having "presented a somewhat heightened picture of the mystery-cults."

Wherever Paul enters the picture, the scenes of his life are finely dramatized and we see a virile, persistent, effective preacher, leader, organizer. Paul's letters, to be sure, are treated quite uncritically and without reference to historical setting, and the religion of the Apostle is almost completely neglected; yet this can hardly be called a fault in a book which aims expressly to paint a picture and not to discuss New Testament literature or religion as such.

---

THE LITERATURE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. By E. F. Scott. New York: Columbia University Press. 1932. Pp. 312. \$3.00.

Ever since it was known that E. F. Scott was preparing a companion volume to Professor Bewer's "The Literature of the Old Testament" Bible teachers have anticipated acquiring a tool of great value. Professor Scott's task was not so difficult as his col-



league's, the material was simpler, more intelligible and easier to deal with. His success is, therefore, not quite so noteworthy, even though the book is equally readable and informing. It is of course a much smaller book, treating as it does fewer literary units. In its method also it quotes the actual text much less, aims less to interpret the contents of the New Testament and in general sticks quite closely to the subjects usually understood in Bible Study under "Introduction."

The writing displays Dr. Scott's usual ease and clarity. He is always easy reading and he never cumbers his pages with learned notes or references. A little of that ease carries over to his solution of the problems of origin, though he is careful to indicate the difference between theories that are quite tentatively presented and those which seem fairly certain. He definitely avoids espousing original or extreme suggestions, as unsuited to a book intended to be elementary or representative. This is illustrated by his somewhat cool attitude to the Proto-Luke hypothesis and his very modified acceptance of complete Aramaic antecedents for the evangelists. He deals somewhat more receptively with *Formgeschichte*. But in no case does he give technical names or identify the sponsors of ideas. Except in the well chosen bibliography no name of a modern scholar appears in the book.

As a readable sketch for the layman or quite elementary text book for the student, the work should prove most useful,—as good as any on the market. It still leaves unfilled the demand in English for an excellent and thorough modern New Testament introduction, suitable to the needs of both teachers and more advanced students, in which the minutiae of evidence, the data for the reader's own independent judgment and the stimulus for further inquiry may be provided.

As the most original, full and sympathetic passage the reviewer would select Professor Scott's treatment of First John. On the other hand in some matters outworn hypotheses

seem to be accepted that even conservatives need no longer retain.

Henry J. Cadbury

Harvard University

THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By James Hardy Ropes. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1934. Pp. vi+117. \$1.50.

The four chapters which make up this little book were originally delivered by the late Professor James Hardy Ropes as lectures and the editors have deemed it wise to retain the oral form. A separate chapter is devoted to each of the first three gospels, while a concluding chapter deals with general questions. Professor Ropes' method has been to compare the gospels for their diversities with a view to determining the aim of each writer in selecting and arranging his material.

The Gospel of Mark, Professor Ropes emphasizes, should not be judged by biographical standards. The Gospel of Mark is the discussion of a theological problem in the form of a dramatic historical sketch . . ." (p. 12). The author attempted to answer the problem so vital to primitive Christians, how to reconcile their firm belief in Jesus as the Messiah with the fact of his tragic and even ignoble death. To this end alone the writer of the earliest gospel selected his material and on this basis the large omissions of the book if considered as historical narrative may be explained.

Matthew is no more to be described as a biography of Jesus than Mark. "It is rather a systematic compendium, or manual, of what could be known in Matthew's day about the life of Jesus Christ and about his teachings" (p. 44).

The Gospel of Luke, however, is intended to be read as historical narrative, together with its sequel, the Book of Acts which Professor Ropes describes as "better history than a good many modern scholars have been willing to allow" (p. 61). While he accepts the

traditional view that the author of the gospel is Paul's friend and companion, Luke the physician, Professor Ropes believes insecurely established the view that Luke used in addition to Mark the hypothetical second written source, the so-called "Q" document. "There is another alternative, namely that Luke drew these sayings from Matthew, and in the present state of the investigation it ought not to be excluded from consideration" (p. 67).

In the final chapter of the book, in addition to a general discussion of the synoptic problem, Professor Ropes touches briefly upon recent phases of gospel research including the "history of forms," and the question of original Aramaic gospels. He does not believe that form-history has thus far achieved solid conclusions. While suspending final judgment, Professor Ropes inclines toward the view that Mark at least is translated from an Aramaic original.

Although addressed to the general reader of the gospels rather than to the specialist, these chapters nevertheless possess insights and present points of view which will make stimulating reading for the more experienced student of the gospels as well.

Friends and acquaintances of Professor James Hardy Ropes and indeed all readers of the New Testament may well be grateful that this last contribution of a distinguished New Testament scholar has been published.

Adelphi College *Carl Everett Purinton*

**THE LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST.** *Charles and Eleanor Raven.* Cambridge University Press. 1933. Pp. 263.

One of the difficulties that confronts a college teacher of the Life of Jesus is the question of how to present to the student the gospel material when the object kept in mind is two-fold: first, to introduce to the student the problem of sources, and, secondly and more important, to set forth, as adequately as may be, a true picture of the life of Jesus as re-

vealed in these sources. If the gospels, in the form in which they have come down to us, are studied one after the other it is difficult for the student, already perhaps vaguely familiar with their contents, to disentangle the sources; on the other hand, if a Harmony of the Gospels is used the relations between the gospels may stand out in individual details but there is no clear impression gained of the story as a whole.

This little book, written by Prof. Raven in collaboration with his daughter, may be for some teachers the solution of this problem. The method is to give practically the entire gospel material in the language of the Revised Version but analyzed into documents. The story of Mark comes first, divided into sections with subject headings which leave the impression that the book is a carefully constructed literary work. Whether the headings represent the outline as it lay in the mind of the original writer or not they are certainly legitimately drawn from his narrative and helpful to the modern student. The "Q" source is given next. There would of course be difference of opinion as to what may properly be called "Q" but here are included all the passages common to Matthew and Luke only and to be able to see these at a glance is of decided advantage to the student. Then follows the special Lukan material. Separated thus from the Markan and the "Q" sources, the line of a different narrative stands out distinctly. Lastly some of the teachings found only in Matthew and the narrative portions of the early chapters of the Fourth Gospel are added. Such an arrangement makes a very usable text.

One turns perhaps with special interest to the chapter on the Teaching of Jesus. Canon Raven gave us in an earlier work his conception of the inwardness and universality of Jesus' message as a "gospel of love." Here in a brief summary the point specially stressed is that there is no contradiction between this teaching and the apocalypticism which must

be recognized as one of the characteristics of Jesus' thought. The author divides Christ's ministry into three distinct periods and places in one or another of these periods all the words that have come down to us. He then endeavors to show that from beginning to end it is only form that changes, that in subject and spirit the message is one. Thus the unity and harmony of Christ's teaching and the revelation brought to the world through his person are the convictions emphasized in this book.

Wellesley College

*Eliza H. Kendrick*

AND THE LIFE EVERLASTING. By *John Baillie*. New York, Scribner's, 1933. xvii—250 pp. \$2.50.

This is a charmingly written book on a perennially fascinating theme. Professor Baillie is thoroughly familiar with the thought of the Ages as to the "life everlasting" in the different civilizations of the world. He is also familiar with the opinions of the great thinkers from Plato and Aristotle to the latest contemporary writers. His knowledge of the great literature and poetry of the Ages seems equally extensive and thorough. In this book he traces in outline a history of the hope of the future life in the religions of the world from primitive man onward. He then sketches the loss of interest in it in recent times and the doubts of the humanistic school concerning its reality. In the last three chapters of the book he endeavors to establish for a modern Christian a basis of hope in the "life everlasting." To Professor Baillie that hope is grounded in the character of God and in the eternal value of human personality. With sympathetic understanding of the difficulties of the problem and in a charming style he traces the "logic of hope" and the "nature of eternal life," concluding his work with an attempt to show that we are "strangers and pilgrims" on the earth, and that human life is dwarfed and meaningless if we do not realize

that "we have here no contemporary city but that we seek one to come."

While Professor Baillie seems to realize that often the thought of Christians has been so centered upon the Kingdom of God in Heaven that it has become an "anodyne" to the ills of the present life, and while he seems to realize that it is very difficult to keep the proper balance between a sane this-worldliness and an inspiring "other-worldliness" he does not seem to the reviewer fully to appreciate the meaning of the Christian Gospel for the present world. Scientists hold out to us the hope that the world with men living on it may continue yet for a hundred million or a billion years. That does not seem an ill-grounded expectation if it has already continued for two thousand millions of years or more. We are able through a study of anthropology to appreciate what progress the race has made since the Java man lived a million years ago. With the Christ as regenerator and leader of mankind, it does not seem too much to hope that the Kingdom of God may in the long future be established upon the earth. This aspect of the matter, writers like Baillie seem to the reviewer, not sufficiently to appreciate.

On the other hand, Baillie is right in insisting that the conception of a blessed immortality with God gives to individual human life a meaning that it could not have if we are only links in a racial chain that must at some time have an earthly terminus, even if that terminus be a hundred or a million of years hence.

The book is heartily to be commended.

*George A. Barton*

University of Pennsylvania

RELIGION AND PERSONALITY. By *Edgar S. Brightman*. Abingdon Press, 1934. \$1.50.

The appearance of a new book by Professor Brightman is always an event, because it is bound both to stimulate thinking and to



strengthen religious faith. If it elicits controversy, as not infrequently happens, the net result is a clarification of issues. I find my copy of "Religion and Personality" bristling at some points with marginal question marks, but underlined on every page, for the book is packed with new ideas and with old ideas freshly stated. It consists of five Lowell Lectures delivered in King's Chapel, Boston, their titles being human personality, a personal God, the finite-infinite God, personal religion, and social religion.

This review can do little more than outline the argument. Dr. Brightman defines the self as conscious experience capable of achieving rational and ideal values. This is not to be identified with the physical organism or with the sub-conscious. God is a Supreme Person, infinite in the sense of being eternal, self-existent and perfect in goodness, but limited in power, as man is, by passive elements within His own nature which frustrate His purposes. Such a God, though finite, is unconquerable, and is the object both of religious quest and of religious trust. Personal religion, grounded in the supersocial, finds its true function in man's cooperation with God to raise society to a level nearer the divine purpose. Both politically and religiously, an organic pluralism of freedom within control is to be preferred to any form of absolutism or atomistic individualism. Throughout the author's defense of his "hypothetical personalism" runs the conviction that one's concept of personality, human and divine, matters so much that the religious believer is obligated both to put it to the test of reason and to live dynamically by its implications.

Elmira College

Georgia Harkness

#### THE FINALITY OF JESUS FOR FAITH

—An Apologetic Essay. *Alex Martin*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1933. Pp. 217. \$2.00.

The title and sub-title of this thirtieth series of Cunningham Lectures may seem a bit

archaic to American readers. When they realize that the essayist is a Scottish theologian, surprise will vanish. In characteristic style the author lays down his premises, answers his opponents, and reaches his conclusion. Grant him his premises, the conclusion is of course inevitable. While disclaiming any attempt to define the person of Jesus dogmatically, this series of lectures none the less moves definitely, as of course it must, in the field of dogmatic theology. The irenic tone and intelligible vocabulary are accordingly all the more welcome.

Jesus Himself can be understood and evaluated only as He is brought personally into consideration along with the truths He enunciates. His finality thus by no means consists in His teachings alone, which could be, and perhaps are, duplicated elsewhere. It is His person, the fact of His life, that is new and creates the new. A thing is what it does. This sound bit of metaphysics is the clue to the nature of Jesus. No interpretation of Jesus which claims to be historical can deny His claim to be the fulfillment of His nation's hopes. If we deny Him this, we must give up as hopeless the attempt to put together a verifiable picture of the historic Jesus. Since He was this fulfillment He was by necessity in a unique relation to the Divine, and accordingly sinless. This sinlessness, however, was not a mere perfection of personal moral character, which could serve us solely as an example. It was this to be sure, but was far more. It was, as a direct consequence of His Messiahship, His faultless fulfillment of His unique life-task, namely the setting right of the entangled relations of the world's spiritual history. Thus His task was essentially that of laying the condition of pardon—He was accordingly the Saviour—and at the same time of acting as the Judge.

Thus the statement of Bousset—"He never overstepped the limits of the purely human"—is refuted. Rather, "He is men's absolute authority in that inner sphere in which their



truest life is lived; and there is literally no surrender which He does not feel Himself entitled to require of them. He accomplishes the purpose of the ages; and to His person the destiny of mankind is linked indissolubly." Here stands the accomplished debater. By His very carefully phrased statements and genuinely devout tone He has built a structure, in which we may not wish to live but which we hesitate to seek to destroy.

*Morton S. Enslin*

Crozer Theological Seminary

# THE REVOLT AGAINST MECHANISM.

*L. P. Jacks.* New York, The Macmillan Company, 1934. \$1.00. 77 pp.

Teachers of religion who have felt the force of the waves of naturalism and mechanism beating against them will be heartened and helped by this excellent little book.

Doctor Jacks is in agreement with Loisy that the mind in its wholeness is a born rebel against all forms of mechanism. The author finds this rebellion of the human spirit not as a mere hatred against the mechanisms, but "a hunger for the creative life they suppress."

The thesis of the book may be expressed in a single sentence, "What is needed is the re-education of man up to the point where no kind of machinery is his master but all kinds his servant."

In his usual style the author grips the mind and heart of the reader and holds them to the end.

Drew University *Frank Glenn Lankard*

A HISTORY OF RELIGION. *By Herbert H. Gowan.* Morehouse Publishing Company, 698 pp., 1934. \$3.50.

Although there are many excellent qualities in this history of religion, it belongs to a type which I had supposed had ceased to be written. It is encyclopedic in scope. Beginning with 200 pages on the religion of primitives, 200 pages are devoted to the state religions of antiquity, 100 to the religions of

the Orient, and 300 to Judaism, Mohammedanism and Christianity. The vast scope of the work has the distinct advantage that the whole field of religion is surveyed from a unified point of view, but the disadvantage that the author is obliged to derive practically all his material from secondary sources. For the same reason, many aspects of the subject are of necessity treated so briefly that the result is not very illuminating. Few scholars in the field today would undertake such an ambitious task. Most of the authoritative works represent the cooperation of different specialists in respective fields. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that there is still something to be said for such a unified treatment as the present. A student who desires an elementary presentation of the whole field written simply and attractively will find it here.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of the book is its point of view. The author approaches every form of religion in all the ages with sympathy and appreciation, that is, up to a certain point. The evolution of the whole history of religion is one organic whole. But Christ is the apex of all the evolution. Christianity is the culmination of all the religious aspirations of the race. The remarkable feature of the book is not that the author reaches this conclusion at the end, but that he begins with it. He is very frank in stating this at the outset. Now no one could find fault with him for reaching this point of view, provided he would proceed by the use of an objective method which is rationally defensible, but what he does is to assume his position without argument. That means that the whole structure of his work rests not upon reason but upon dogma. The most elementary principle of scientific study is that it must be based upon reason. This book, therefore, scarcely belongs to the science of religion; it is Christian apologetic. But the Christianity which it presents is enlightened and tolerant.

*Selby Vernon McCasland*

Goucher College

RUMEILEH Being the Ain Shems Excavations (Palestine) Part III. *Elihu Grant*. Biblical and Kindred Studies No. 5. Haverford College, Haverford, Pa. 1934. IX-99 pp. Quarto pages 12¼ x 9½, with three full size color plates, six zinc line cuts, 32 copper half-tone illustrations, and six maps. List, \$10.00. Special discount to Institutional Libraries.

This is a most sumptuous volume, a fine illustration of the art of printing, and worthy of its contents.

The contents fall into two parts: the first part deals with a description of the excavations of Rumeileh in 1933; the second part is a supplement to Parts I and II, a glossary-index.

To instance one illustration of the value of these finds and their description for light on obscure biblical passages: The reviewer many years ago read a paper on Hosea's metaphor of the oven in 7:1-7, before the Society of Biblical Literature. He called attention to the fact that the description of the oven in this passage implied that the fire was kept "banked" *from the kneading of the dough until it was leavened, while the baker slept all night, in the morning it burneth as a flaming fire*. During the discussion, a member asked what kind of an oven it could have been, the ordinary type not fitting the situation. The book under review answers the question, after long delay and many inquiries on the subject. On pages 49, is a description of an oven not in use among the poor but among the rich. In the words of Prof. Grant, "I remember the use in Palestine of large stone lined ovens with a smooth floor whereon a fire of wood was brought to its height, then swept out, *or to one side* (italics the writer's), before round loaves were thrust in on a long-handled paddle of wood and baked on the hot paved floor." This exactly fits Hosea's description and brings light on an obscure passage.

Haverford College and Prof. Grant deserve

our thanks for a rich contribution to Light from the East.

Syracuse University

*Ismar J. Peritz*

NEW LIGHT ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. By *Allen Howard Godbey*. University Litho Publishers, Norman, Oklahoma. Pp. ix-127. \$3.50.

The author has created a super-notebook that reveals the encyclopedic resources of his fertile mind and at the same time supplies an inductive approach to the Old Testament that will freshen up many a musty Bible course. This is not a text for the teacher who wishes to lecture "at" his class; it is for those who wish to lead students on an adventure of discovery.

The rapid advances in Palestinian archaeology quickly outmode the current text books. Data are often buried in scattered, rare, technical bulletins and reports. If Dr. Godbey issues supplementary notes year by year, culling the best and sending them out to be added to the present work, he will be making a real contribution to biblical study, both as to method and content.

If this material had been issued in book form it would probably have had wider notice. However, as an instrument for the application of the author's method, the lithotyped, paper covered form, having blank pages inserted for additional notes is even preferable to a formal volume. Placing the text on the left hand page is a bit awkward, but the consequent difficulty of fingering pages and focusing the eye is offset by the ease with which notes can be written on the blank right hand pages. Students would be greatly helped by an index.

Dr. Godbey's work will appeal especially to those who have felt that textual analysis and documentary theories must be supplemented by the tangible data supplied by archaeology. He has long contended that Old Testament history must be re-written in the light of Pales-

tinian life and history as revealed by modern research. In his enthusiasm for such an approach he is going to lay himself open to criticism. Sometimes he seems dogmatic in statement, or seems to "plant" his evidence by leading the student through a certain series of references that call for a conclusion in line with the author's own ideas. However, that is nothing new in biblical "science," and Dr. Godbey's erudition calls for pause before rejection of his ideas. His voluminous references will be valuable to the instructor, to say nothing of the new world thus opened to the student.

*Carl Sumner Knopf*

University of Southern California

THE SPADE AND THE BIBLE. By *W. W. Prescott*. Introduction by George McCready Price. New York: F. H. Revell Co., 1933. Pp. 216. \$2.

Scissors and paste are here unsparingly used to support the author's thesis that "archeological discoveries support the Old Book." As is to be expected, the writers most frequently quoted are those who, like G. M. Price and Melvin Grove Kyle, belong to the conservative wing. Essentially the book is an assembling of campaign material from carefully selected sources against the so-called higher criticism. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch is vindicated, as is also the "supernatural working of a supernatural God." Quoted with approval is the contention that "higher criticism is already bankrupt." As a result of archeological research, we are told, "the mouth of the scoffer is stopped." Despite our sympathy with the author's protest against certain reckless types of critical scholarship, we must conclude that a *tendens* document of this sort is devoid of all scientific value, and can be of little service to him who would honestly and fearlessly follow wherever truth may lead.

Yale University

*George Dahl*

A PRACTICAL TEXTBOOK OF THE HEBREW LANGUAGE. *Menahem Naor*. Jerusalem: Divan Book and Art Shop, 1933. Pp. viii+100+127.

The recent Palestinian revival of Hebrew as a living language is bound to impart new vitality to the study of that ancient tongue. It is not at all improbable that teachers will soon be expected to conduct class exercises in the Hebrew. Consequently the appearance of a textbook taking account of the spoken vernacular is both timely and interesting. In the present volume the essential grammatical material has been covered, although with perhaps too great faith in the student's capacity for quick absorption. Two main sections constitute the book: (1) a Grammar consisting of an Introduction and 26 lessons; (2) a Reader, all in Hebrew, of 55 lessons. The latter consists largely of extracts from the Bible and interesting Jewish tales; it is in part unpointed. Pictures from Palestine further enliven the text.

Unfortunately the author seems to lack full mastery of the English. Consequently many errors of form and grammar dot the pages. A new edition should be painstakingly gone through for mistakes in the English. In spite of this obvious defect, however, the book deserves hearty commendation as a fresh and stimulating approach to a language not dead but intensely and eagerly alive and growing.

Yale University

*George Dahl*

THE MODERN APPROACH TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. By *Jewett C. Townsend*. The Stratford Co. Boston, 1934. Pp. 239. \$2.00.

There have been many attempts during the past generation to present in a single volume the modern view of the Old Testament and its results. This one will seem to the college teacher of Bible rather sketchy, and occasionally not quite accurate; as, for example, in the list of books given as belonging to the Apocrypha, which includes some works which



do not belong here. It is professedly written from the standpoint of the pastor rather than of the scholar, and is intended primarily for teachers in the Church School who have been wondering what modern criticism is all about. As a first aid to such persons it will serve a useful purpose. The author is evidently working at second hand, but has read diligently some of the best books. The running sketch of the Old Testament books in order is preceded by a discussion of traditions in general and the relation of the Hebrew to the Babylonian tradition, and it is followed by a description of the developing idea of God, which is one of the best things in the book.

*Elbert C. Lane*

Hartford Theological Seminary

**MEN WHO STOOD ALONE.** The Hebrew Prophets in Action. *Mary Jennes.* Morehouse Publishing Co., 1932. 114 pp. \$1.00.

**THE TEACHER'S GUIDE.** To the above. 1934. 74 pp. 90c.

The first book is a series of stories centering about thirteen of the Hebrew prophets. With the exception of the first two chapters which overemphasize the dramatic and supernatural in the Elijah-Elisha narratives, the reviewer would recommend this book as a unit of work which could be used effectively with groups of children in the 7th to the 9th Grades (10-14 years) in either church or elementary schools. The stories are vivid and imaginative with enough touches of the modern in their setting to make them real to the pupil. Even of this age child, the teacher should know the biblical narratives so well that he could help the child trace out in them the basis of the stories. But no imaginative adaptation of biblical material, however skillful, can serve as a substitute for the Bible story itself. Nor could such a series of stories be used as a text for sophomore-senior years in any course which purports to have the same educational values as corresponding courses in

other fields of history and biography. Biblical students must learn to use their source material with discrimination and interpretation as well as with appreciation.

The second book is more valuable. It would be an essential to anyone using the first as a text. However, many of the suggestions could be carried out more effectively by more mature students. It provides an excellent collection of resource material, especially stimulating to anyone using the project method and interested in the modern application of the prophets to social problem.

The Master's School *Maude L. Strayer*

**THE STORY OF THE GERMAN BIBLE.** *P. E. Kretzmann.* Concordia Publishing House. St. Louis. 1934. 78 pages.

This is the second book on Luther that Dr. Kretzmann has written as his contribution to the proper celebration of the quadricentennial of Luther's translation of the Bible into German. It is in English, written in simple language and full of facts. The topics discussed are: the first contact of German people with the Gospel; Ulphilas and the first Germanic (Gothic) translation of the Bible; the establishment of Christianity in Germany; the first translation of parts of the Bible in Germany; Tatian's "Gospel Harmony" in the first German rendering; Alliterative poetry and the Old Saxon "Heliand"; Otfrid's "Gospel-Book" and other mediaeval versions; Psalteries of the 14th and 15th centuries; the eighteen pre-Lutheran translations of the Bible; the beginning of Luther's work as translator; Luther's translation of the New Testament; the completion of the whole Bible in German; early imitators of Luther; the influence of Luther's work upon the translations of others; other German translators since Luther and the later history of the text. There is also a short bibliography. Luther's German translation is the most important Bible translation in the world. It gave the greatest impetus to Bible translating and profoundly



ational

Bibli-  
source  
pretat-

would  
t as a  
could  
nature  
ection  
ing to  
inter-  
e pro-

ayer

IBLE.  
ishing

at Dr.  
ion to  
ennial  
o Ger-  
simple  
s dis-  
erman  
e first  
Bible;  
Ger-  
Bible  
y" in  
poetry  
"Gos-  
Psal-  
; the  
f the  
rk as  
New  
Bible  
; the  
ransla-  
s since  
There  
Ger-  
Bible  
reatest  
oundly

J  
O  
O

VOL

T

meet  
tory  
men  
guid  
our  
size.  
prese  
in th  
grap  
truly  
ficial  
grow  
is ev  
which  
ors.  
in th  
prese  
rejoic  
Th  
we g  
tinue  
civili  
reign  
of th  
the c  
distr  
and e

"The F

do not belong here. It is professedly written from the standpoint of the pastor rather than of the scholar, and is intended primarily for teachers in the Church School who have been wondering what modern criticism is all about. As a first aid to such persons it will serve a useful purpose. The author is evidently working at second hand, but has read diligently some of the best books. The running sketch of the Old Testament books in order is preceded by a discussion of traditions in general and the relation of the Hebrew to the Babylonian tradition, and it is followed by a description of the developing idea of God, which is one of the best things in the book.

*Elbert C. Lane*

Hartford Theological Seminary

**MEN WHO STOOD ALONE.** The Hebrew Prophets in Action. *Mary Jennes.* Morehouse Publishing Co., 1932. 114 pp. \$1.00.

**THE TEACHER'S GUIDE.** To the above. 1934. 74 pp. 90c.

The first book is a series of stories centering about thirteen of the Hebrew prophets. With the exception of the first two chapters which overemphasize the dramatic and supernatural in the Elijah-Elisha narratives, the reviewer would recommend this book as a unit of work which could be used effectively with groups of children in the 7th to the 9th Grades (10-14 years) in either church or elementary schools. The stories are vivid and imaginative with enough touches of the modern in their setting to make them real to the pupil. Even of this age child, the teacher should know the biblical narratives so well that he could help the child trace out in them the basis of the stories. But no imaginative adaptation of biblical material, however skillful, can serve as a substitute for the Bible story itself. Nor could such a series of stories be used as a text for sophomore-senior years in any course which purports to have the same educational values as corresponding courses in

other fields of history and biography. Biblical students must learn to use their source material with discrimination and interpretation as well as with appreciation.

The second book is more valuable. It would be an essential to anyone using the first as a text. However, many of the suggestions could be carried out more effectively by more mature students. It provides an excellent collection of resource material, especially stimulating to anyone using the project method and interested in the modern application of the prophets to social problem.

The Master's School *Maude L. Strayer*

**THE STORY OF THE GERMAN BIBLE.**

*P. E. Kretzmann.* Concordia Publishing House. St. Louis. 1934. 78 pages.

This is the second book on Luther that Dr. Kretzmann has written as his contribution to the proper celebration of the quadricentennial of Luther's translation of the Bible into German. It is in English, written in simple language and full of facts. The topics discussed are: the first contact of German people with the Gospel; Ulphilas and the first Germanic (Gothic) translation of the Bible; the establishment of Christianity in Germany; the first translation of parts of the Bible in Germany; Tatian's "Gospel Harmony" in the first German rendering; Alliterative poetry and the Old Saxon "Heliand"; Otfrid's "Gospel-Book" and other mediaeval versions; Psalteries of the 14th and 15th centuries; the eighteen pre-Lutheran translations of the Bible; the beginning of Luther's work as translator; Luther's translation of the New Testament; the completion of the whole Bible in German; early imitators of Luther; the influence of Luther's work upon the translations of others; other German translators since Luther and the later history of the text. There is also a short bibliography. Luther's German translation is the most important Bible translation in the world. It gave the greatest impetus to Bible translating and profoundly

influenced all the major translations, including Tyndale's, the King James' and the Revised English versions.

Luther College

O. M. Norlie

**THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** *Julius A. Bewer.* Revised Edition. Columbia University Press, 1934. 464 pp. \$3.00.

This standard work appears now in revised form, after 12 years before the public. The revision extends, however, only to the bibliography which has been enlarged from 8 to 12 pages and brought up to date. It is a masterly presentation of the historical development of the literature contained in the canonical books of the Old Testament, based upon first-hand study of the originals, clearly and sympathetically expounded, and fully illustrated with quotations from the biblical text in original translations. It is an indispensable guide book and text book.

**THE STORY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** *Edgar J. Goodspeed.* The University of Chicago Press, 1934. 187 pp. \$1.00.

This is a companion volume to the author's well known "Story of the New Testament." It begins with Amos and includes the apocryphal books, discussed in chronological order. The salient teachings of each book are stated succinctly, with reference to their historical background. It is a reliable, scholarly, and up-to-date treatment, designed for popular use, and by its "Suggestions for Study," well fitted for use as a textbook in introductory courses.

**A CHRISTIAN YEAR.** *George P. Hedley.* The Macmillan Company, 1934. 254 pp. \$2.00.

This is a series of 52 brief biblical expositions based upon the Scripture lesson of the day in the order of the church calendar for

the year. The treatment is not conventional, but fresh, pointed, and alive to the application of scriptural teachings to the social, moral, economic, and philosophic problems of today. Each of the topics lends itself admirably not only for public and private devotion, but also as a basis for group discussions.

**SNOWDEN'S SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS 1935.** *James H. Snowden.* The Macmillan Company, 1934. 370 pp. \$1.35.

It aims to be popular, practical, free from any kind of bias, whether sectarian or critical; and it is one of the best of its kind; but from the point of view of biblical instruction represented by NABI, it appears conventional, with insufficient background of modern biblical study.

**THE LIVING UNIVERSE.** *Sir Francis Younghusband.* E. P. Dutton & Co., 1933. 252 pp. \$3.00.

The author is primarily a man of affairs, but he has a predilection for writing on scientific, philosophical and theological subjects. The book under review was given in epitome as a Hibbert Lecture and published in the *Hibbert Journal*. It is one of a large number of books just now appearing which, like L. P. Jacks' "The Revolt Against Mechanism," register a protest against a merely material interpretation of the universe. The author traces the development of the universe through its stages of matter, life, mind, creative love, to the great mystics as the highest product of evolutionary process. In the second part, the author declares, following the lead of the philosophy of Bergson, that the cosmic factors may be summed up in that creative love to which we all owe our very being, and which ultimately springs from that Mighty Personality of whom the whole vast material universe is the bodily manifestation. The book possesses vigor and an optimistic outlook; and it is a pleasure to read it, even if you cannot agree with all that is said.

# TWENTY-FIFTH ANNUAL MEETING

December 26 and 27, 1934

Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York City.

## DECEMBER 26

- 4:00 P. M. President's Address.  
Business.
- 6:30 P. M. Anniversary Dinner.  
Historical Sketch: The First Twenty-Five Years.  
Greetings from charter members and others.
- 8:30 P. M. The Excavations at Samaria (illustrated), Dr. Kirsopp Lake of Harvard University.

## DECEMBER 27

- 9:00 A. M. A Symposium. "Framing a World-View: How can we so teach the Bible as to help the student construct a satisfying philosophy of life."  
W. Gordon Ross, Professor of Philosophy and Bible, Berea College, Kentucky.  
Hugh A. Moran, University Pastor, Cornell University.  
Eugene W. Lyman, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Union Seminary.
- 10:00 A. M. Discussion.
- 11:00 A. M. Adjournment.

## TEACHING RELIGION TODAY

By GEORGE HERBERT BETTS

*Professor of Religious Education,  
Northwestern University, Chicago*

"Leadership training groups and college classes will find reverent attitudes, wise content, effective methods, portrayed with brilliant simplicity by a foremost educator."  
—Paul H. Vieth, Editor

● "It conserves the best of *How to Teach Religion* and adds the rich experience of the intervening years. I believe firmly that it will live for many, many years and enrich the lives and improve the teaching of thousands."—Lawrence W. Johnson, *Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago.*

● "I consider this book the most significant utterance by far that has been made upon Religious Education up to date. No one who is engaged in Religious Education, whether he be layman or minister, can afford not to read this book."—R. A. Kent, *President University of Kentucky.*

● "Upon closing the final chapter one feels immediately impelled to come before a class and take up his teaching opportunity with new vision and understanding."—Paul E. Johnson, *Hamline University.*

Price, net, \$1.25, postpaid

At the Better Bookshops

**THE ABINGTON PRESS**  
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO  
BOSTON PITTSBURGH SAN FRANCISCO  
DETROIT KANSAS CITY PORTLAND, ORE.

## FOR SECOND HAND THEOLOGICAL BOOKS

LARGEST STOCK IN AMERICA. Over half a million THEOLOGICAL BOOKS.—Classified by Subject. CATALOGUES free. Correspondence and "Want Lists" invited.

Please mention this paper.

**Schulte's Book Store**

82 Fourth Ave.  
New York City

There is No Waste Circulation  
Problem in connection with

## JOURNAL ADVERTISING

For Rates Address

PROF. ISMAR J. PERITZ, Editor  
Lake Bluff, Wolcott, N. Y.



100

100

100